

THE CASE OF DOYLE v. HOUDINI

IN the volume of essays by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle which appeared only a week or two before his regretted death, he has affirmed that "the greatest medium-baiter of modern times" was undoubtedly the conjuror Houdini.¹ It is probable that this does not overstate the case, and I should be inclined to go further and to say that, on the other side of the Atlantic at any rate, no one has done more than Houdini to bring Spiritualism into disrepute. If one may venture to form an opinion at this distance from the scene, the prevalence of deliberate imposture amongst mediums is notably greater in America than in England. Sir Arthur himself in the volume referred to confesses as much, and while, of course, still maintaining the trustworthiness of such claimants to psychic powers, as the Davenport brothers in the past, or Mrs. Crandon at the present day, his defence of mediumistic honesty is no longer quite so confident as it was in his "History of Spiritualism." Though nothing but ignorance, as he contends, can suppose that there are no real mediums, "at the same time the States, and in a lesser degree our own people, do need stern supervision." "I admit," he adds, "that I underrated the corruption in the States."²

If this be so, Houdini in his rather noisy campaign, was not merely tilting at windmills. The evidence of fraud in many cases was overwhelming, and he was able to reinforce his contention that all spiritualistic phenomena are faked, by himself performing marvels even more inexplicable than any mediumistic feats capable of being brought to the knowledge of the general public. We should probably be right in concluding that Houdini's denunciations were largely responsible for the sceptical attitude of so many intelligent American Catholics at the present day. Baron Liljencrants, apparently with the full support of the late Cardinal Gibbons and the Catholic University of Washington, as well as Father de

¹ "The Edge of the Unknown," by Arthur Conan Doyle, John Murray, p. 1. The chapter which he entitles "The Riddle of Houdini" occupies no less than 62 pages.

² *Ibid.* p. 7. In his "History of Spiritualism" (I., p. 128) A.C.D. had written, when speaking of exposures, "Some of these exposures at long intervals are true indictments of some villain, but usually they are greater deceptions, conscious or unconscious, of the public than the evils which they profess to attack."

Heredia, S.J., and Dr. J. J. Walsh, have all committed themselves to a view which, practically speaking, denies the reality of any spiritualistic manifestations of the physical order. In their eyes the marvels produced by D. D. Home, Stainton Moses, and the Fox sisters were all tricks. This attitude, as I have previously urged, seems to me a mistaken one, and an unsound foundation must inevitably weaken the force of any argument based upon it. If we want to get rid of Spiritualism we shall not effect our purpose by pretending that the phenomena are nothing but imposture. Nevertheless, it does not follow that because the great "medium-baiter" was convinced of the fraudulent character of the spiritistic wonders he had witnessed, he was therefore a deliberately untruthful person whose word could not be trusted when he denied the intervention of any psychic agency in the performance of his own marvellous feats.

Although Houdini's first great successes were achieved in England in 1900, and though he paid several long visits to this country at a later date, his name and his career are not so well remembered here as in his native land. It may be well, then, to say that this master magician was born at Appleton, Wisconsin, in 1874. His father was a Jewish rabbi named Weiss who had emigrated from Hungary. There was a large family who were in straitened circumstances, and Erich, the seventh son, from quite early years earned a little by his exceptional aptitude for acrobatic feats and for every development of the showman's business. Locks, rope ties, mechanical devices, and tricks of legerdemain were an unfailing source of interest to him throughout his life. When he was 20 he married rashly and tempestuously, a girl of 17, whom he had hardly known for more than a week, and, strange to say, the union proved a singularly happy one. She was, it seems, a Catholic of German family, by name Beatrice ("Bessie") Rahner, and though their nuptials were at first a sort of Gretna Green affair, a Catholic priest put matters right soon afterwards when a proper dispensation had no doubt been obtained. As a son and a husband, Erich was irreproachable. Struggling on and for the most part engaged in a variety of small side-shows in which the young couple both took part, they maintained a dire conflict with poverty for half a dozen years. Houdini, as he elected to call himself, after the great French conjuror, Robert Houdin, neither smoked nor drank at any period of his life. At their little domestic celebrations he

loved to regale his wife and his friends with champagne, but he never touched it himself. He kept himself fit for his performances, many of which demanded strength and endurance of no ordinary kind, by constant physical training. A large proportion of his earnings he regularly transmitted to his mother, and the husband and wife were content to go hungry as long as her needs were provided for. The pair had their occasional tiffs, for they both had tempers, but no reader of Mr. Kellock's biography can entertain a doubt of the depth of affection which united them. Years afterwards, when Houdini, now unrivalled in his own profession, was persuaded to take part in certain film dramas, so constructed as to give scope for some of his most marvellous displays, we are told how

The directors in charge of the film were greatly troubled by their hero's casualness in the love scenes. Houdini's puritanical soul apparently shrank from this part of the game, and his nervous reluctance in such scenes aroused no little merriment among his associates. One frantic director after trying vainly through a futile morning to persuade Houdini to embrace the heroine as if he were not submitting to a painful duty, as a last resort entreated Mrs. Houdini to leave the lot. "Whenever we get him to the point of kissing the girl," he said, "he spoils the shot by glancing anxiously at you."¹

But the famous conjuror was certainly not a hen-pecked husband who lived in terror of his diminutive spouse. She herself recounts an incident of their quite early days, which proves very clearly that he knew how to assert himself when he thought the occasion called for it.

He had forbidden me [she says] to go to a certain show which bobbed up in a town where we were playing. I was just as determined to go. He said the show was unfit for me, and if I disobeyed him he would spank me and send me home. Naturally after that warning I went to the show. He followed me, carried me out, spanked me thoroughly, divided all our poor savings, led me firmly to the railroad station, bought my ticket to Bridgeport where my sister lived, and put me on the train, placing our pet dog in my hands just before the train pulled out.

¹ Kellock, "Houdini," p. 270.

At the last minute, lifting his hat courteously, he said : "I always keep my word ; Good-by, Mrs. Houdini." My heart was breaking, and I was on the edge of hysteria, but the memory of the spanking rankled and enabled me to reply with a pretence of calm dignity : "Good-by, Mr. Houdini."

"Bessie" goes on to relate how her husband, always considerate, had wired so that she might be met at her destination. She was petted and fussed over, but she confesses that she was intensely unhappy and ready even to beg forgiveness on her knees.

Six hours later, at 2 a.m., the bell rang and I heard Houdini's voice. I flew to the door, and we fell into each other's arms weeping. "See, darling," said Houdini, "I told you I would send you away if you disobeyed, but I didn't say I wouldn't fly after you and bring you back."

As this story sufficiently hints, Houdini's standard of propriety was a high one. His biographer tells us that "he would do anything sensational to draw crowds, but he had one rigid taboo. He abhorred smut and would never tolerate it." So when certain friends in Paris took him to a place of entertainment where a dance was performed which he considered outrageous, he left the theatre in a fury and wrote in his diary : "the two women who did it ought to be publicly horse-whipped." Moreover, we are told that he was not only a rigid monogamist himself, but that he exacted as much of his intimates. If they violated his code they stepped out of his life. No one could possibly accuse him of being either timid or diffident. His self-assertiveness, in fact, was one of the points which unfriendly critics were most ready to dwell upon to his disparagement, but when living among the film-artists at Hollywood, he admitted with a quaint mixture of truth and irony : "I am afraid I am not much of a lady's man. I am so old-fashioned that I have been in love with the same wife for twenty-five years."

Houdini's affection for his mother was even more conspicuously manifest to all who came in contact with him. Doyle, in the book above referred to, says that it seemed to be the ruling passion of his life, and that after her death he expressed it on all sorts of public occasions "in a way which was, I am sure, sincere, but is strange to our colder Western blood." When she was still living, the quaint fancy seized him of

purchasing a dress he had seen in a shop window which had been made for Queen Victoria. He paid a considerable sum for it, and had it sent out for his mother to wear in the States. He wrote to her every day even when the Atlantic was between them, and his interest in Spiritualism seems to have developed only after she had passed away, and to have been created by his intense desire to get into communication with her once more. But he could never persuade himself that any of the messages which purported to emanate from her were genuine, and the traces of fraud which he repeatedly encountered in the course of this quest so disgusted him that towards the close of his life his persistent campaign against mediums became almost an obsession. To this matter we shall have to return later on, but for the moment we may note, as another curious trait in his deeply affectionate nature, that when his mother was taken from him in 1913, he adopted the practice of writing a letter every day to his wife, even though they were hardly ever separated. "These letters he would hide about the house," we are told, "as parents hide Easter eggs for their children. For six months after his death in 1926, Mrs. Houdini continued to discover them at intervals."

It is again a testimony to the substantial goodness of the man that his assistants were devoted to him in spite of an endless succession of stormy outbursts on his part when they failed to do at the moment exactly what he wanted. Of the three most closely associated with him one was with him twenty years and the other two eighteen.

All three [says his biographer] adored Houdini. They carried him to his grave. Several times a month he would have a violent quarrel with one or other of them and give them the traditional two weeks' notice to quit. None of them ever paid any attention to such incidents, and Houdini would have forgotten by the next day all about the angry dismissal.

Much to his distress, he had no children of his own, but his delight in children was one of his most characteristic traits. Hardly a week went by without his giving a performance at some hospital or orphan asylum. He was constantly arranging to have a whole section of the auditorium given over gratuitously to some poor-school for an afternoon or evening and he even invented an entertainment specially adapted for the blind. In Edinburgh when he realized the number of

little ones who came to the performance barefoot, he made provision to have them fitted with shoes. No doubt he was not indifferent to the fact that all this was good advertisement, for the showman instinct was part of his nature, but there can hardly have been any subtle purpose behind an incident recorded of him in Glasgow where he kept his audience waiting ten minutes while he stopped to mend the broken crutch of a little crippled girl he had met in the street. His fondness for animals and birds was not less manifest and it was only equalled by his skill in teaching them tricks. His fox-terrier "Bobby," became quite expert in releasing himself, in imitation of his master, from a pair of tiny handcuffs specially made for him. So again, when another pet dog "Charlie" fell ill during Houdini's European tour in 1909, his diary records the fact, and adds "Bess crying. I don't feel any too good"; while on the following day appears the entry: "Poor dear little Charlie dog died. He is out of his misery. Has been our only pet and earned all our love."

If I have recorded these trivialities in some detail, it has not been without an object. Sir A. C. Doyle, while himself doing justice to Houdini's many amiable and attractive qualities, has, perhaps unintentionally, given the impression that he met his death under the influence of some sort of spell or curse. He was, according to A.C.D., possessed of quite extraordinary psychic gifts, and these he prostituted to base uses, making them not only the source of pecuniary gain, but actually employing them to discredit the very powers which made him what he was. In reading this chapter one gets the idea that the great magician was a sort of Dr. Faustus who had sold his soul to the devil and that, in the world beyond, a term had been fixed when the spirits of evil would infallibly claim their own. For example, we are told:

I suppose that at that time Houdini was, from an insurance point of view, so far as bodily health goes, the best life of his age in America. . . . ! Yet all over the land warnings of danger arose. He alluded in public to the matter again and again. In my own home circle I had the message some months before his death, "Houdini is doomed, doomed, doomed!" . . . But as the months passed and fresh warnings came from independent sources, both I and, as I believe, the Crandons, became seriously alarmed for his safety. He was on one side of his character, so fine a fellow that even those who were

attacked in this monstrous way, were unwilling that real harm should befall him. But he continued to rave [against mediums] and the shadow continued to thicken.

Sir Arthur goes on to recount how Mr. Fulton Oursler, a friend of Houdini's and apparently, like A.C.D., a spiritualist, wrote, after all was over, to say that the famous wizard had sensed the on-coming of death without understanding the significance of the warning. In particular he had telephoned to Oursler in these terms: "I am marked for death. They are predicting my death in spirit circles all over the country." Seeing that according to the same witness, a medium, Mrs. Wood, had declared *three years before* that "the waters are black for Houdini" and that disaster would befall him while performing before an audience in a theatre, there is nothing very convincing about this alleged prophecy, and it was quite natural that the person so threatened, in talking to his spiritualist friend, should comment upon the amiable predictions by which the mediums were trying to scare him from pursuing his anti-spiritualist campaign.

I must confess that the whole episode seems to me a revelation of one of the most objectionable aspects of these supposed communications with the other world. It reminds one painfully of the belief in "Malicious Animal Magnetism" which obsessed Mrs. Eddy. If Houdini was superstitious—and there is evidence that there was something of this in his character, for we are told that on any Friday which happened also to be the thirteenth day of the month, he would never undertake his more dangerous feats—such prophecies would be likely to depress him greatly in any spell of ill health, and might consequently contribute not a little to their own fulfilment. What is much more certain is that Houdini was a man of extraordinary resolution. Incident after incident recorded by his biographer shows how he would go through with things according to the prearranged programme even when he was almost fainting from some accidental physical injury. In such a career as his he esteemed it his first duty to conquer fear, and no surer way could have been found to make him foolhardy in neglecting such concessions as advancing years demanded, than to hurl at his head the predictions of the mediums that he would break down in the performance of one of his more daring exploits. If Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, as I do not doubt, was absolutely sincere in his belief in the reality of the messages received from the world of spirits,

Houdini on his side was equally convinced that the whole business was fraudulent, or at best illusory. If he were to allow himself to be shaken by such warnings as he received nothing remained for him but to give up his career and retire into obscurity. Sir Arthur does full justice to the intrepidity of the friend whose attitude towards spirit communications was the very antipodes of his own. He even appeals to the superhuman audacity of the feats which Houdini performed as conclusive proof that they could not have been accomplished by natural means.

He had [writes Doyle] the essential masculine quality of courage to a supreme degree. Nobody has ever done, and nobody in all human probability will ever do, such reckless feats of daring. His whole life was one long succession of them, and when I say that amongst them was the leaping from one aeroplane to another, with handcuffed hands at the height of three thousand feet, one can form an idea of the extraordinary lengths that he would go.¹

Mr. Kellock bears similar testimony :

Hundreds of thousands of persons in various cities have seen Houdini, stripped and securely handcuffed by police experts, leap from some bridge or boat into a stream or harbour, on some occasions in weather so cold that a hole had to be cut in the ice before he could jump, and have seen him emerge again within two minutes free and smiling. Other hundreds of thousands have seen him incased in a police strait-jacket, and thus securely trussed, suspended, head downwards, by a block and tackle, outside some public building, and have watched him free himself within a few minutes.²

Sir Arthur maintains that in these and other equally daring exploits there was a certain psychic element. Houdini informed him, it appears, that "a voice which was independent of his own reason or judgment, told him what to do and how to do it." So long as he obeyed the voice he was assured of safety. One cannot but suspect that A.C.D., has put his own interpretation upon words which were uttered without any such implication in the speaker's mind as his opponent has attached to them. No one possessing a competent knowledge

¹ "The Edge of the Unknown," p. 2.

² Kellock "Houdini; his Life Story" (1928) p. 1.

of psychic research and its past history, can read Houdini's volume "A Magician among the Spirits" without discovering that he talks and reasons very loosely. He makes confident assertions upon very slender premises, and Doyle is quite right in saying that the book is full of errors of fact.¹ One can understand that the amount of patter and advertisement which is an essential part of the showman's equipment, is likely to dull his sense of the value of accurate statement. Moreover, I strongly suspect that Houdini in talking to his spiritualist acquaintances was always trying to draw them out, and that he deliberately played up to their prepossessions just to see what they would say. Certain it is, in any case, that the great magician, on all occasions, denied in the most solemn terms that his feats were performed by any but natural and physical means. This is testimony of a very different kind from the casual conversational utterance to which Sir Arthur appeals. When the wizard escaped from packing-cases nailed down and corded by expert workmen, leaving apparently the cords and nails intact, without indication of how the escape was effected, and when on countless occasions he freed himself in a few minutes from all the handcuffs, fetters, and cells which the police of the greatest cities of Europe and America could find to restrain him, the spiritualists, utterly baffled, were forced to declare that such marvels could only be accomplished by psychic power, by the dematerialization, in fact, of his physical body. Several years ago Doyle wrote to Houdini during one of his visits to England:

My dear chap, why go round the world seeking a demonstration of the occult when you are giving one all the time? Mrs. Guppy could dematerialize, and so could many folk in Holy Writ, and I do honestly believe that you can also. My reason tells me that you have this wonderful power, though I have no doubt that up to a certain point your strength and skill avail you.

Sir Arthur's tone became more impatient as time went on. He distinctly insinuated that Houdini could not obtain any convincing communication from his mother because he disavowed

¹ As a striking illustration I may note that Houdini takes it for granted that that resolute sceptic, the late Frank Podmore, was a Spiritualist, and he assumes that Podmore would be likely to say everything which could be said in defence of the reality of any spiritistic phenomena. Apparently Houdini had no more ground for this strange distortion of the truth than the fact that Podmore was a member of the Society for Psychical Research. See "A Magician among the Spirits," p. 41, note 3.

and misused his psychic powers. "Such a gift," he wrote, "is not given to one man in a hundred million that he should amuse the multitude or amass a fortune."¹ Further, the spiritualists, as we have seen, were insistent in their predictions that he would come to a bad end. But Houdini did not waver in his attitude and only pursued more actively his campaign against American mediums.

I do claim [he said] to free myself from the restraint of fetters and confinement, but positively state that I accomplish my purpose purely by physical, and not psychical means. My methods are perfectly natural, resting on natural laws of physics. I do not *dematerialize* or *materialize* anything. I simply control and manipulate material things in a manner perfectly well understood by myself and thoroughly accountable for and understandable (if not duplicable) by any person to whom I may elect to divulge my secrets. But I hope to carry these secrets to the grave as they are of no material benefit to mankind, and if they should be used by dishonest persons they might become a serious menace.²

The secrets, it seems, were never divulged, but there is not the slightest reason for suggesting that there was anything sinister or abnormal about the great magician's death at the early age of 52. He suffered an accidental strain in one of his sensational escapes on October 11, 1926, but, though in great pain, he pluckily went on with the performance, and indeed appeared again on the two subsequent days. Then he collapsed, and had to go to hospital. During his convalescence he made light of the injury, as was his wont, and was visited by some University students. He was supposed to be normally as immune from injury when struck, as if he had been made of india-rubber, and one of these idiotic lads thought this occasion, when he was lying in bed, a suitable opportunity for testing his powers of endurance. He seems to have been allowed to strike him three heavy blows in the abdomen, and four days later Houdini, who for some weeks previously had been over-tired and run-down, died of traumatic appendicitis. A pathetic, but surely quite natural, termination of the career of a man over fifty, who, for thirty years, had been straining his physical powers to their utmost limit, and who had

¹ See Kellock, "Houdini," pp. 14 and 308—9.

² Kellock, "Houdini," p. 15.

escaped, on more than one occasion, only by the skin of his teeth after injuries sustained in his phenomenal feats. How does Sir Arthur's calm assertion that Houdini, in 1926, "was, from an insurance point of view, the best life of his age in America" agree with the following facts condensed from the printed *Life*?

In 1911 Houdini had to undergo a minor operation for an abscess that had developed on his body from his daily struggles to escape from strait-jackets. A little later a first class specialist in Pittsburgh informed him that he had ruptured a blood vessel in one of his kidneys. He insisted that he ought to give up his strait-jacket escapes, etc., and told him that if he went on as he was doing he would be dead within a year. In spite of great pain he persisted in all his feats until the engagement was concluded, but he said nothing to his mother or his wife. Early in 1912 he tore a ligament in his side and thereafter continued his performances in much pain and distress. The injured kidney did not heal for some years and even then he always slept with a pillow under his side.¹

What, again, are we to make of the following account of one of the magician's attempts to rival the burial feats of the Indian fakirs? I borrow it from Mr. Hereward Carrington's recent book and I may note that the writer, though not a spiritualist, is a believer in the physical phenomena of certain mediums, including those of Mrs. Crandon.

Houdini remained submerged in a metal coffin for about an hour and a half; but when he emerged he was deathly white, running with perspiration and with a pulse of 142. I was present at this experimental burial, as at many others, and know whereof I speak. It is my opinion that Houdini appreciably shortened his life by this endurance burial.²

It is possible that Houdini did say to A.C.D., as the latter reports, that in performing his feats "a voice told him what to do," and that he added, "It all comes as easy as stepping off a log, but I have to wait for the voice." I venture to comment, in view of the description just quoted, and of others of similar purport, that Houdini, if he did so speak was only letting off a little showman's gas. It was no bad advertisement for him if Sir Arthur and his fellow spiritualists proclaimed

¹ See Kellock, "Houdini," pp. 229-231.

² Carrington, "The History of Psychic Science" (1930), p. 187.

open-mouthed through two continents, that Houdini's achievements so transcended the known forces of nature that they could only be explained by some traffic with the occult.

It would take too much space to discuss in any detail an incident to which Sir Arthur gives prominence, and which he adduces to prove that when an advertisement was hoped for Houdini was unscrupulous in the methods he adopted to bring it off. A.C.D. charges the magician with having boasted beforehand that he would expose the Crandons, and with having employed in the séances which subsequently took place some very discreditable devices to throw suspicion on the medium. There is no reason to doubt that the charge is made in perfect good faith, but Sir Arthur himself was certainly not present on any of these occasions and he supplies no references by which it would be possible to test the accuracy of those informants from whom his report is derived. Even from his own narrative it is plain that the accused did not admit the facts alleged, and propounded a very different version of what occurred.

One feature which unmistakably differentiated Houdini's marvels from those of the séance room was the fact that he stood committed to a definite programme which he never failed to carry through. The best of mediums can never guarantee the production of phenomena. In all reports of séances we are liable to be told that the conditions are not favourable, that there is not enough power, that the presence of a particular person or of too many people is hampering developments, that they must talk more, or sing more, that they must sit upright and draw in their legs, that they must preserve contact, that nothing can happen until the modicum of red light has been further diminished, etc., etc. And when all the requirements have been complied with, it happens over and over again that the sitting proves almost entirely negative of results. In Houdini's experiments, he practically never failed, though he sometimes reappeared, after a more strenuous escape from confinement, bruised and with his clothes torn to shreds.

But of course, the strongest argument of all was his own unwavering denial that occult forces had anything to do with the feats he performed. He frankly took an interest in Spiritualism, first because from childhood he had been interested in tricks and every kind of legerdemain, and secondly because he was intensely anxious, if that were possible, to get into

touch with the mother he had loved so tenderly. As his biographer tells us :

He retained some curiosity about the possibility of posthumous communication even when he had encountered nothing but disappointment in his relations with mediums.

His carefully planned pacts with his friends show that. According to his pact with his wife, in the event of his death she was thereafter to attempt a tryst with him once a week. Each Sunday at a fixed hour, she was to take her favourite photograph of him, sit with it before her for half an hour, and concentrate on communication. If something of him survived, and it were possible to bridge the gulf, he would give a sign.

Mr. Kellock, writing more than a year after Houdini's death, states that his wife had faithfully fulfilled the conditions but without result. Houdini was not an observant Jew, though he remained faithful to some of the customs of his forefathers, but he respected genuine religion. He was not avaricious, though he stood out for good terms, and being vain of his position as "the great Houdini" insisted on his name heading the bill. His charity was not confined to cases in which it had an advertising value, and he was often the last refuge of the down-and-outer, especially in the case of those who belonged to his own profession of showman. Abstemious as he always proved himself and courageous in upholding high moral principles, I find it impossible to believe that his whole life was an acted lie. And it must have been that, if his wonderful performances had all been effected by some unavowed magic of psychic origin or by any kind of evil compact with the powers of darkness.

HERBERT THURSTON.

"THE BROTHERS VRAU"

OUR national prosperity, our whole material civilization, depend, as is now universally owned, on the reconciliation of Capital and Labour, the assuagement of that secular quarrel between the two human factors in industry, which started when, and because, both were out of reach of the influences of the true religion. Both sides are working to-day for that reconciliation, knowing that unless they can combine to live, they will severally perish. Both, therefore, should be keenly interested in the instances of successful union which are to be found at work in France at the present day. Our readers have already learnt from a MONTH article—"Leon Harmel: a Pioneer of Industrial Peace," (July, 1928)—of the industrial paradise established at Val-des-Bois, near Rheims, and based on unity of interest between employer and employed and a frank recognition of the ethical and religious character of human trade-relationships. But the Harmels are not the only Christian employers to show that Capitalism need not be Godless nor Labour altogether soulless. Equally well known are "the brothers Vrau," whose great manufactories near Lille, are conducted on the same Christian principles as those of the MM. Harmel, but whose work for God's Church extended far beyond the commercial sphere. To their activities—a proof that the "work of the laity" is all-important in God's designs—is largely due the spiritual revival in northern France during the last years of the nineteenth century. The Vrau family owned a small thread factory in the town of Lille. Philibert, the only son, who was born in 1829, lost his faith in late boyhood and recovered it largely through the prayers and influence of Camille Féron, a young medical student and his great friend. Subsequently with all the energy that was to be motor power of countless activities, he wished to become a monk, and it was Camille again who pointed out to him his duty toward his father who was fast ageing and unable to direct the factory which was financially deteriorating. Philibert obeyed the call, but all his life he was a solitary in spite of the number of his acquaintances who were scattered all over France. But Camille also was called upon to make a great sacrifice: he was already director of the School of Anatomy and a brilliant pro-

fessional future lay before him. In the poorest quarters of the town he was well known as the "poor man's physician," while at his own house he opened a dispensary, an almost unknown thing at that time. In 1861, he married Marie Vrau, the beloved and saintly sister of Philibert, thus forging another link of friendship with her brother. Five years later, Philibert asked him to become a partner in the firm, the growth of which called for his help. He cheerfully gave up his beloved profession for the sake of the wider scope for service offered him, and set himself like any humble employee to learn the elements of this novel employment. On the death of Monsieur Vrau, Camille took the name of Féron Vrau. It was noted of him that through life he always took the second place, he hid in the shadow of his brother-in-law whose brilliant gifts of organization were to be seen, not only in the Vrau factory, but also in his numerous ecclesiastical activities.

On the spiritual side no less than on the temporal, the Vrau enterprise expanded on its association with two such energetic spirits: nuns were introduced to supervise the welfare of the female workers: a chapel was annexed to the factory with the celebration of the patronal feast with all due honour, and a statue of Christ the Worker was erected.

The notion that a master owed any moral responsibility for his workmen was as little realized by industrial France of the nineteenth century as it was in our own country. But Godless industrialism in France, or at least, in Lille was overthrown by the introduction of God. The initial "gesture" was a retreat which took place at the Jesuit house of Chateau Blanc, situated midway between the large manufacturing centres of Lille, Tourcoing and Roubaix. A number of employers were persuaded with some difficulty to attend, and at the close of the Exercises, they formed themselves into a little band with the avowed intention of reforming their individual workshops upon a Christian basis, and of studying the varied social implications of their charge. Later, he conducted a hundred and twenty-eight masters of industry to Rome, to rejoice the heart of the "Workers' Pope"; and, again, two hundred employees whose expenses were entirely paid by their employers and a sprinkling of the smaller of these last, came also to Rome led by the Vrau brothers and Leon Harmel of Val-des-Bois, whom, at an earlier date, Philibert had visited and from whom he gained much encouragement.

The town of Lille owes a network of religious and social

activities to the generosity and energy of the two brothers: first in importance on the secular side—if exclusively secular it can be termed, for everyone of their organizations had for its ultimate object the sanctification of its members—is the Catholic University. Here Vrau money was lavishly spent, while Philibert laboured indefatigably to rouse public opinion in its favour, to obtain government authorization to confer academical degrees, and pre-eminently to found a medical faculty so greatly desired by Camille. Here the arsenal of the Union of Prayers, another of the Vrau activities, was put in action; its members by means of periodical leaflets, turned the artillery of their intercessions upon some specific object of desire, with, it is hardly necessary to add, marvellous results. Some two hundred students were in residence during the first year.

Another important undertaking was the school of Arts and Crafts, where the sons of the employers were trained; to which was added the Commercial School for future foremen. Close to the University stands the Catholic Young Men's Club, where the Catholic youth of the town, some two thousand strong, used to congregate, including not a few University students,—a mixture of "Town" and "Gown" impossible nearer home.

Philibert insisted upon, as constituents of the Club, a priest director and a chapel with Reservation, and succeeded in securing them in spite of much opposition. "These young men," he declared, "are destined to make a public profession of their faith before the world, and for this spiritual weapons are necessary." In the spacious rooms of this institution, many committees found a rallying ground: the most important in point of numbers, was the Committee of Northern Catholics, which was inaugurated on the morrow of the upheaval caused by the Franco-Prussian war. Its aim, like that of the Parisian Committee on which it was modelled, was to unite the scattered forces of Catholicism for mutual encouragement and the protection of Catholic interests, and its ambition was to spread to all the towns of Northern France. Nor was this an empty aspiration—for at the expense of countless journeys on the part of Philibert, and many letters, the various centres were brought into line, episcopal sanction obtained, and the result is the flourishing Congress of Northern Catholics, which meets yearly at one or another of the large industrial centres.

Philibert's life-work was the defence of Catholic interests:

in the strictly spiritual sphere he and Camille were pioneers in the work of Nocturnal Adoration and Reparation, the importance of which was so little realized in those days that even the Brothers of St. Vincent of Paul lent only half-hearted support. By the expenditure of patient labour it was finally firmly established and not only at Lille but in other towns, and it is pleasant to read that the poorest parishes provided the largest numbers of worshippers. It was Philibert, also, who, when, in 1880, the idea of an International Eucharistic Congress was first launched, by means of the holy Mlle Tamisier, offered Lille as the initial meeting-ground, and went off instantly to Rome to obtain Papal sanction for it.

Lille was growing apace, and the existing churches were totally insufficient to meet the situation: Philibert made a plan of the town, marking in red ink where the new parishes should stand, and drew up a report appealing for public assistance. Seven new churches were built, and the larger share of the expenses were met by Vrau generosity.

When the laws against the French congregations and in favour of divorce came into action, Philibert did what one man could to counteract the iniquity: a dozen like him might have beaten the atheists. He wrote, or got written, a powerful exposure of the Government's action, and arranged with an advertisement agency to distribute 600,000 copies throughout the country. Again, in 1882, he issued a declaration, drawn up by the Committee of Northern Catholics, protesting against the secularizing of education, and got each signatory to promise never to permit his children to attend the lay school. The account of how money was raised by the "Dernier de l'Ecole," parents visited, the expenses of the poorer children defrayed by those in more prosperous circumstances, all this makes encouraging reading for English Catholics, who have borne with similar injustice and still have to struggle for their rights.

And what of Camille, the good doctor who remained at home with his hand at the helm during his brother-in-law's many absences? They worked together on the Council of the Brothers of St. Vincent of Paul, Camille watching over the legal and financial side of the work while Philibert saw to the development of the organization and founded the regional congress of the two dioceses of Arras and Cambrai.

Camille never forgot the insight into the homes of the poor gained during his medical career: one of the problems caused

by the rapid expansion of industry, was the housing of the industrial worker, and to this he devoted particular care. To his credit also must be laid the formation of the Catholic Medical Association, which at the outset included some fourteen individual committees taken from the large towns. He himself made a donation of 500 francs and collected 10,000 francs for a votive chapel at Montmartre for the medical profession. In his estimation the doctor's work was a vocation, the spiritual aspect of which should always be uppermost in his mind, and who can estimate how far Camille's own example and the high ideal he set before himself acted as an incentive to his medical brethren? Doctor Boissarie of Lourdes was a firm friend of the brothers whom he met at Lille when he came to address the University Medical students; they in turn made a pilgrimage to Lourdes as a result of which they arranged that two medical students should go annually to Lourdes at the time of the large pilgrimages, establishing in perpetuity two burses to defray their expenses.

During the last years of Philibert's life after his mother's death in 1888, he was absent from home nine and ten months in the year, travelling from one town to another on his various spiritual enterprises, with no luggage but a small handbag, journeying and lodging as cheaply as he could, and refusing all social invitations. The leisure thus secured he spent with greater profit in visiting the Blessed Sacrament in one of the churches. The object of these journeys was two-fold: firstly to accustom his numerous organizations at Lille to work without his actual supervision, and, secondly, to act as a connecting link between the scattered and often isolated members of his many committees and works of propaganda. His aim was to do good, as much as possible, "by stealth," but he could not prevent the esteem of his fellow-citizens. "I am more attracted towards God than towards my fellow creatures," was a favourite saying of his, but that meant that he saw God in those around him. He would certainly have recognized the hand of Providence in the incident that marked his last moments with the blessing of persecution. He returned home early in 1905, suddenly stricken by what was to be his last illness when he was charged and convicted as having retained a community of nuns, although in secular attire, to supervise the welfare of his female employees. Condemned to a fine of 500 francs and a month's imprisonment, he appealed, and when the case was heard again, his friend and lawyer rose and

said, to the shame, let us hope, of those petty persecutors :
 "Monsieur President, Monsieur Vrau is dead."

Both brothers found support and inspiration in their work by Marie, the beloved wife and sister. It was her example and pious counsels which first led her husband to follow the path of perfection : as it was the love of her that induced him to abandon his medical career. Their son Paul is worthy of such parents : in the year 1900 when the Assumptionist Fathers were driven out, and their great work of the Bonne Presse, which included the flourishing Catholic daily, *La Croix*, was menaced with extinction, Paul, on his own initiative, and unknown to his relatives, took over the work and it has continued in his family to this day. Camille survived his brother-in-law three years : his last visit was for his beloved poor, when at the cost of much suffering, he dragged himself to the house of the Little Sisters of the Poor, at their request, to be god-father to an old man of seventy. The cause of the brothers Vrau, to whom Benedict XV. alluded jocularly as "the frock-coated saints," was introduced at Rome in 1924 in response to many petitions and with the strong support of all the members of the permanent Committee of the International Eucharistic Congress for which they had worked so zealously. It is a cause which should interest all who have at heart the reconciliation of Capital and Labour, for the careers of these "capitalists," like that of Leon Harmel, afford a striking picture of Pope Leo's great Encyclical in action.

I. HERNAMAN.

A MEDIÆVAL CARLYLE

IN "The Opalescent Parrot" Mr. Alfred Noyes makes delightful fun of those "intellectuals" who imagine that Carlyle's day is done. That he is far from being the spent force these "advanced" folk would have us believe is made very evident in a volume just published by Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, entitled "Round by Repentance Tower," by S. Sagar.¹ The writing shows literary distinction, but the matter is even more notable. The book is, in fact, the most illuminating study of Carlyle that we have had for a long time.

Mr. Sagar gets the right point of view from the start when, on an early page, he describes his subject as "a peasant who had lost the priest." He remained that to the end. Fashionable literary London never overcame the original strain. "The peasant," to quote Mr. Sagar, "has seen his stable domestic economy of hard work, thrift and independence, scorned and defeated by a system of shoddy mass-production, scandalous waste, cushy jobs and servility, a system which he has felt to be unstable, ephemeral and disastrous. . . . This, then, was Carlyle: an abnormal peasant, possessed of such an unconscious loyalty to his class that in spite of education and the patronage of the great he remained a peasant: some might say a cantankerous peasant, anyhow a type of man who instinctively reacts against any idea that is made much of, that is too prone to regard such an idea as a commonplace of superficial minds; a type that is destined to spend long years in obscurity and witness lesser men 'strut and fret their hour upon the stage'; a lonely man, knowing friendship but hardly companionship."

It was in accordance with this character that he had little sympathy with or understanding of the political aspirations of the new industrial class. Parliamentary Reform, the Franchise, Owenism and the like won from him no more than growling contempt. He did not even see what underlay the movement of which these were the symptoms. The Christian idealism behind the democratic tendencies of his times escaped him. His attitude towards Democracy might even be described as reactionary. Not, of course, that he threw himself into the resistance of the traditional Conservatives—

¹ London: B. O. and W. Pp. xii. 180. Price, 5s.

landed proprietors, capitalists and the like. His was the reaction of the peasant suspicious of what seemed cheap remedies, legal devices, parliamentary oratory.

The reason for this blindness as stated by our author is significant. He could not appreciate its deeper meanings because the Revolution in France, from which the English movement derived so much of its inspiration, was associated with infidelity. "He belittled it, because he regarded it as wholly the product of the irreligious. He knew there was something lacking in it. He was just the kind of man to be offended by that smell of the library and the academy which hung around it. He felt that it was inspired by an idea that men could manage very well here below without worrying much about what world, if any, lay beyond. Carlyle had a tremendous conviction that men couldn't. 'If they ever banish God from their poor bewildered hearts there will be such a world as few are dreaming of.' He knew, perhaps because he came of stock that had long been in close touch with Nature, that Nature was not sufficient for man. He half despised the formulas of the Revolution because he felt that there was about them an air of finality that was fallacious. The authority of the Sovereign People aroused no enthusiasm within him unless he was convinced that it was supported by another higher and ultimate authority."

This religiousness was a very marked characteristic. It led him at times, in spite of his Calvinist upbringing, to striking utterances indicative of sympathy with Catholic institutions. It led him to declare the Mass the most genuine expression of belief left us. It led him to retract much foolishness in his references to the Homöousion and Homoiousian controversy, by confessing that, if the Arians had won, Christianity "would have dwindled away into a legend." It led him to write, in "Past and Present," with reference to Abbot Samson's Church :

Our religion is not yet a horrible restless Doubt, still less a far horribler composed Cant; but a great heaven-high Unquestionability, encompassing, interpreting the whole of Life. Imperfect as we may be, we are here, with our litanies, shaven crowns, vows of poverty, to testify incessantly and indisputably to every heart, That this Earthly Life and its riches and possessions, and good and evil hap, are not intrinsically a reality at all, but *are* a shadow of realities eternal, infinite; that this Time-world,

as an air-image, fearfully emblematic, plays and flickers in the grand still mirror of Eternity; and man's little Life has Duties that are great, that alone are great, and go up to Heaven and down to Hell. This, with our poor litanies, we testify, and struggle to testify.

It is remarkable that the man who wrote this should have had, apparently, no knowledge of that sturdy contemporary of his, William Cobbett. He had much in common with the Editor of *The Register*. Both were peasants, both were in arms against the Parliamentaryism of their period, both looked backward for a solution of their difficulties. "Cobbett," says Mr. Sagar, "was in possession of just the values which Carlyle required. Cobbett could have told him that the Catholic Church was not dead." That he should have failed to encounter one so much after his own heart who could have supplied just the key he needed is one of the tragedies of his life. For if Carlyle had seen the Church as Cobbett saw it he would have submitted to her authority. He was fond of emphasizing the close relation of vision to practical obedience.

But there is an even graver omission in his knowledge. What would have happened if he had studied, as he studied Abbot Samson, the thirteenth century Poet who wrote "*Piers Plowman*"? Professor Minto, I believe, has remarked on the strong likeness between Will Langland's poem and the teaching of Carlyle. The parallel, indeed, up to a point, is almost startling.

In both cases we find men of robust religious character, peasant-like in their sturdy moral sense and independence of parties and schools, forced by the circumstances of their times to ponder deeply the problem presented by economic suffering and social disturbance. With all the sympathy he showed for the agricultural labourer, Langland was as little disposed to support the Peasants' Rising of 1381 as Carlyle to throw in his lot with the Chartists of 1848. Both were isolated individuals looking with equal disapproval on the corruption of the ruling class and the reckless despair of the oppressed.

The combination of Hebraic moral earnestness, human sympathy and the gift of caustic speech is the same in each. They belong emphatically to the people, yet never flatter them. The whip of satire is applied indiscriminately to all classes as occasion demands. The faults which the thirteenth century Poet perceives are the same as those pilloried by the nineteenth century Prophet. And their speech has the same

rough edge, the same graphic realism, the same homely humour. They are of the open air. Despite the fact that Langland was more familiar with the interior of taverns than Carlyle ever was and gets nearer to "the man in the street," we trace in each a predilection for the proverbial saying, the popular habit of giving nick-names that stick, the use of similes drawn from humble life. Honesty is their demand, the scamping of social duty their *bête noire*. Langland's scorn for learned clerks and lawyers reminds us of Carlyle's withering contempt for Dryasdust and the literary dilettantes of his time. They express the suspicion of the man familiar with manual toil and the hand-to-hand fight with Nature (who cannot be tricked and demands straightforward dealing), for those whose calling tends to make them cunning rather than thorough, clever rather than profound. Langland was no Chaucer, moving in courtly circles; Carlyle was no Tennyson, hobnobbing with royalty.

But the strongest point of similarity is that found in the remedy they propound for the evils of their respective ages. "There is a perennial nobleness, and even sacredness in Work," wrote the Modern Prophet. "Were he never so benighted, forgetful of his high calling, there is always hope in a man that actually and earnestly works: in Idleness alone is there perpetual despair. Work, never so Mammonish, mean, is in communication with Nature; the real desire to get Work done will itself lead one more and more to truth, to Nature's appointments and regulations, which are truth. The latest Gospel in this world is, Know thy work and do it." Says the Mediæval writer:

'Yea, I bid thee,' says Hunger, 'or else the Bible lieth,

Go to Genesis the beginning the father of us all':

With swynk and swot and sweating face

Toil thou and travel and truly win thy living.

And Wisdom saith the same. 'I saw it in the Bible.'

*The sluggard would not plough for sloth; he shall beg in
winter and it shall not be given him.*

Matthew with a man's face tells of one that lent

To three manner of men to traffick with, to profit by,

And he that best laboured was best allowed,

And for his labouring was lord of his lord's goods,

The wicked servant had a talent but as he would not work

Nothing had he of his master ever more after.

Common sense wills that every wight should work

In ditching or in digging, in teaching or in prayer,

Life active or life contemplative.
 The man that feedeth himself in faithful labour
 He is blessed by the Book in body and in soul.

Quotation can scarcely do justice to the emphasis this principle receives, but its importance to him can be seen from the place it takes in the confession he makes of his personal shortcomings. It is too long to be cited as a whole, but the opening lines are a sufficient indication of its general character :

Once when I had my health in hot harvest time,
 And my limbs to labour with, and loved good fare,
 And nothing in life to do, but drink and sleep,
 In health of body and mind,
 I came on Conscience, and Reason met me,
 He met me and questioned me, and my memory roamed back,
 And Reason reproved me.

'Canst thou serve as a priest or sing in church?
 Make a haycock in a field or pitch the hay?
 Canst mow or stock or bind the sheaves?
 Canst reap or guide the reapers? Canst rise early?
 Canst blow the horn, and keep the kine together?
 Lie out o' nights, and save my corn from thieves?
 Make shoes or clothes, or herd the sheep?
 Trim hedge, use farrow, or drive the swine and geese?
 Or do any other work that the people need
 To win some living for them that be bedridden?'

'Nay,' said I, 'God help me,
 I am too weak to work with sickle or with scythe.
 I am too long, believe me, to stoop low down,
 Or to last for any time as a true working man.'

Conscience and Reason suggest various explanations for this idleness, but he has to acknowledge at the last that it is his own fault. Whereupon he concludes :

So to the kirk I went to honour my Lord;
 Before the Cross upon my knees I knocked my breast,
 Sighing for my sins, saying my prayer,
 Weeping and wailing till again I was asleep.

There is another confession, put into the mouth of Pride, which sharply divides Langland from the author of "Sartor Resartus" :

I, Pride, patiently, ask for penance,
 First to father and mother was I inobedient,
 Unabashed to offend God and the good,
 Inobedient to the Church and to them that serve her,

I judged her for her vices ; I urged on others,
 With word or wit the churchmen's evil works to show
 Scorning them and others when I saw my time
 That simple folk should think me witty and wise.

If this is autobiographical it means that the Poet was not uninfluenced by Wycliffe's propaganda, but he never became a Lollard, and his submission to the authority of Holy Church gives to his writing a hopefulness and sanity lacking in Carlyle. Things are pretty bad and it may be that the Church itself will need some drastic judgment which will purge it of abuses, but man has always the guidance of a divinely guaranteed Revelation. Langland is not torn this way and that by cruel doubt as was Carlyle. His own duty is always plain and, when public evils seem incurable, this at least can be done. His creed is no misty German transcendentalism, his God is no vaguely looming Figure but One whose Incarnation has made His face familiar, and He it is who at the last will judge. The fatalistic gloom which darkens the pages of the latter-day writer has no place here. The same circumstances as those Carlyle had to meet are confronted with the serenity of faith. The passionate love of justice we find in "Sartor" and "Heroes," is here wedded to a knowledge of Christ. Carlyle's "Gospel" is little more than a reiteration of the duty to labour while it is day. For the solace of harassed humanity he can offer naught but resounding phrases concerning the Immensities and Eternities, Teutonic mists, Brocken spectres, the vastness of an incomprehensible Universe. But the Catholic Poet, sad as he often is, is not forlorn. He has his *Piers Plowman*, the most human conception of Our Lord to be found in the Middle Ages. That was his cure for the wrongs Wat Tyler and his associates hoped to remedy by revolt and pillage—a Peasant Christ, divine in authority, overcoming Death and wrestling with the powers of Hades, but toiling like one of ourselves, suffering heat and cold and weariness, bearing all that we have to bear, and more. This is the picture of Him, somewhat confused it is true since His actual identity with Piers is ambiguous, but wonderfully inspiring :

One like the Good Samaritan, and somewhat like Piers Plowman
 Came barefoot, bootless, without spur or spear,
 Riding on an ass' back, brightly he looked
 Like one that cometh to be dubbed knight,
 To get him his gilt spurs and his slashed shoes.

This Divine Plowman is Charity itself, not to be compared with those who falsely clothe themselves in a semblance of holy poverty :

Therefore not by colour, no nor by learning,
Not by words nor by works shalt thou know Charity,
But by Piers Plowman and that is Christ.

The setting forth of that Figure constituted a real Gospel. Since, however original in conception, it was the Christ of the Church, the ecclesiastical frame-work of Society was respected, the Catholic philosophy of life remained intact to guide bewildered souls, the moral teaching on which Western civilization is based continued unshaken. Yet with all this conservatism, the Poet feels no less free than the Chelsea Sage to castigate the vices and follies of his age and even to lecture unworthy ecclesiastics.

One has seen the sun break through dun masses of storm-cloud and flood the landscape with triumphant light. That is the kind of picture which rises to the mind when one tries to think of how this conception of Will Langland inspiring Carlyle would have transformed and glorified the thunder-clouds of Carlylean literature.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

THE CLASH OF PRINCIPLES IN ANGLICANISM

IV

IF the Anglican Church has no vital connection with the Body founded by God Incarnate to carry on the work of the Incarnation, one is conceivably doing a service to many earnest souls, members of that Church, by demonstrating the fact; just as one obliges a traveller by telling him he is in the wrong train. It is in that spirit that we have endeavoured to show, from what the accredited exponents of Anglicanism have said and written, that the system differs in many radical points from that described by Christ and His Apostles as the one Ark of Salvation. It must be very hard for the average non-Catholic to realize that the Establishment, which has always bulked so largely in the nation's history as the National Church and which is in unbroken possession of the old Cathedrals and parish churches, is yet a man-made institution, dating definitely from the time of Elizabeth, and with as little canonical commission as has the Salvation Army. Yet so it is. Christ founded a teaching Church, proclaiming authoritatively a consistent doctrine. Anglicanism admits that it cannot decide between conflicting "beliefs" and so it professes to be comprehensive of all that its members choose to hold. In Christ's Church there was set up a teaching body, with the requisite endowments of certainty and authority. In Anglicanism, the principle of private judgment, however disguised, holds ultimate sway. Of course, the principles of Comprehensiveness and Congregationalism, if allowed to flourish unchecked, would disintegrate any body which had not, as this has, the strong legal support of the State. It is its constitutional Establishment that enables Anglicanism to present to the scandalized world the portentous spectacle of "a hundred sects battling within one Church." The Bishop of Durham, who is conducting a one-man campaign for Church Disestablishment, is sawing off the bough on which he sits.

"There must be limits" cry the Bishops, while defending comprehensiveness: and, as we have seen, the limits are very definitely set against the two chief Catholic doctrines dis-

carded at the Reformation—the Pope's Supremacy, and the Blessed Eucharist. Few Churchmen, indeed, would receive the former, for one cannot consistently believe in the Papal claims and remain an Anglican. But the main grievance of the Catholicizing party in the Church is that the hierarchy as a whole, and the civil power so far as it regulates preferment, will not countenance the Catholic Eucharistic belief. The reaction to the recent "Anglo-Catholic" Congress has emphasized that fact; the Lambeth Conference at present sitting will emphasize it further. Irritated by the "Solemn Remonstrance" of the 1,100 "Anglo-Catholic" clergy against Episcopal intolerance,¹ one of the diocesans, the Bishop of Ripon, has made the following blunt and uncompromising response :

"The time has come, I think, in all kindliness, to ask those of my fellow Churchmen who when they speak of reunion really mean "Rome" to be content with such things as they already have in the English Church or else to seek their ideal elsewhere. Very large accommodation has of late been made for them in the Church of England at considerable sacrifice of its interests as the Church of the English people, and at no little discomfort to many of its sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons. Some of them have recently presented to the Bishops a rather shrill and petulant demand for more generous recognition of their claims. Others have threatened secession if the South India proposals are endorsed at Lambeth. But no great Church can submit to dictation by one section of its members, especially when submission would imperil the very principle of comprehensiveness by which that section finds a place within it. However great the desire to afford reasonable comfort to that section they must respect the authority of, and accommodate themselves to, the peculiar character of the Church they belong to, and not to try to play the cuckoo in the Anglican nest." Bishop Burroughs : sermon in Ripon Cathedral, 29.5.30.

These being the sentiments of some 90 per cent of the English Bishops, though few would express them so harshly, the comment of the *Church Times*—"Truly the manners and customs of the State-appointed Episcopate are strange"—is only natural. "Catholics," it goes on, "are still inevitably made to feel strangers in their mother's house, when their natural leaders, the Bishops of the Church of England, practically leave the Congress on one side." Here we find an echo of the experience of one who, in his day, knew Anglicanism to its core and was constrained, in the last sermon he preached with-

¹ See THE MONTH, July, p. 34.

in its borders, to ask in vain—"O my Mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet canst not own them? why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? how is it that whatever is generous in purpose, and tender and deep in devotion, thy flower and thy promise, falls from thy bosom and finds no home within thine arms?"¹ It was the Protestantism of the Anglican Episcopate that forced these and other bitter and eloquent words from that sincere seeker after truth, some ninety years ago, and still that Episcopate, almost to a man, is ready, in Newman's phrase (and that of the Bishop of Ripon) to bid Catholicizers begone, "to where they will be more welcome." It is the uniform experience of the "Anglo-Catholics" that, whereas many forms of heresy find toleration, if not encouragement, from the Episcopal Bench, anything savouring of Catholic belief in the Mass or the Blessed Sacrament is frowned on or definitely repudiated by the innate Protestantism of the Establishment. Let them again turn to Newman for an explanation of that phenomenon: they will find it in the first seven lucid chapters in "Anglican Difficulties" Part I., written eighty years ago, wherein the author sets out to show that the Catholic revival was not a natural growth in Anglicanism but that "Communion with the Roman See was the legitimate issue of the Movement of 1833." The "Anglo-Catholics" are preparing to celebrate in 1933 the first Centenary of that celebrated Movement of which they claim to be the legitimate descendants: that claim is justified only in so far as they have kept themselves free from that corrosive "liberalism" which Newman fought against so strenuously: but the Movement itself and their modern claims are alien to true Anglicanism.

It is these "Catholics but not Roman Catholics" that Anglicanism has no use for, as is clearly shown by Episcopal declarations about the central mystery of the Catholic Faith—the Holy Eucharist. It was fear of that faith that caused the State to forbid its creature, the Church, to reform the Prayer Book. The same fear prevents the Bishops from countenancing anything definite regarding the Real Presence or the Real Sacrifice. The "Anglo-Catholics" are actually beginning to quote Mr. Birrell's famous sentence—"It is the Mass that matters; it is the Mass that makes the difference, so hard to define, so

¹ Newman: "The Parting of Friends"; *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, xxvi.

subtle is it, yet so perceptible between a Catholic country and a Protestant one, between Dublin and Edinburgh, between Havre and Cromer" ¹—to indicate the gulf that separates them doctrinally from their Church. Let us try to ascertain her doctrine on this point.

Archbishop Cranmer, the "Father of Anglicanism," laid down his Church's belief thus: "Christ is not present in the Bread spiritually (as He is in man) nor corporally (as He is in Heaven), but sacramentally only (as a thing is said to be in the figure by which it is signified)" ² That was the declared belief, frequently expressed with blasphemous violence as regards the Mass, of all the early reformers; the men, *i.e.*, who framed the formularies of Anglicanism—an assertion of the "Real Absence," a repudiation of the sacrificial idea, a denial of the priesthood, all made by apostate priests who knew what they were about. But it was much too definite for a religion of free-thought and too difficult to reconcile with the Scripture, so later teachers have taken refuge in ambiguity and professed nescience. However, the craving for some sort of certainty has persisted. It is little short of blasphemous to think that God could have conferred such a wonderful gift as the Holy Eucharist on His Church and yet left her in doubt as to its real character. And so we have alongside a profession of ignorance (which in the circumstances is genuine), a demand for definition (which in the circumstances is impossible). We find the first illustrated in the following authoritative saying of Dr. Temple, a former Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in spite of the dogmatism of the first Anglican, Cranmer, laid down as a general principle that, as regards the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist:

"The Church of England has not answered that question." *Charge*, October, 1898.

Various other Bishops have endorsed this opinion, for instance, Bishop Pollock of Norwich:

"The Church of England does not give definitions on the Sacrament of Holy Communion, nor urge special theories. But she protects her children from the error of identifying the Living Christ with the consecrated bread and wine isolated from the service. . . . At this point, the teaching of the Church of Rome and of the Church of England are poles apart." *Sermon at Norwich*, 13.2.28.

¹ *v. Church Times*, July 4th. p. 23.

² *Works* (Parker Society Edit., Bk. IV. p. 238).

The Bishop seems unaware that he is claiming for his Church the power, if not asserting truth, at least of detecting error, in Eucharistic doctrine. The same limited infallibility is asserted by Dr. Headlam of Gloucester, who writes :

"Our own Church has never attempted to formulate its [Eucharistic] belief. It has given us a literature which is in accordance with Catholic tradition (!); it has condemned Transubstantiation and Zwinglianism; and between these limits it has admitted that our belief is free." "Doctrine of the Church," p. 275.

And the Archbishop of York (then of Manchester), in answer to Mr. R. O'Neill, asking in the *Times*—"Is there any change in the bread and wine after the Consecration?" thus lines up with the others, saying :

"Most of us were brought up to believe that the wisdom of the Church of England consists partly in her absolute refusal to give a dogmatic answer to the question." *Times* letter, 18.3.27.

Still, with the inconsistency noted above in Dr. Pollock, he proceeds in the same letter to exhibit his Church as dogmatizing with the best of them. "By its repudiation of transubstantiation it declares that the Bread when consecrated is still Bread." That surely is as much a dogma, in form and intention, as that which declares that, after due consecration, the Bread is no longer Bread but Christ's Body.

The Archbishop of Wales, Dr. Edwards, quotes the famous Bishop Westcott as eschewing the idea of definition, except, of course, in the one anti-Catholic direction :

"I shrink [Westcott wrote in 1900] with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery, but it seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord in or under the forms of bread and wine." Letter to the *Times*, 12.6.28.

Bishop Linton Smith of Hereford agrees with his brethren about his Church's reluctance to define except negatively :

"With regard to the doctrine of the Holy Communion the Church of England has always refused to pronounce upon the exact nature of the result of the consecration of the Elements. She has ruled out certain teaching. . . . The prayer and the practice alike [of Holy Communion] leave to her members exactly the same freedom that has been left to them for the past 350 years. Those who hold what is commonly called the 'receptionist' theory are not committed to anything else, those who hold what is commonly called the theory of 'the Real Presence' are not denied that interpretation." *Diocesan Messenger*, quoted in *Times*, 3.5.27.

This dread of definition is obvious enough to preclude the need of further quotation. Yet the inability to decide between two or three contradictory theories of the Eucharist, which leaves the hapless Anglican doubtful regarding such momentous issues as the Real Presence or the Real Sacrifice, is felt to be such a reproach to a body professing to be part of the Church of Christ that, whilst the dogmatism of Cranmer is constantly re-echoed, officially Anglicanism is always trying to come to a closer agreement on the subject. Bishop Barnes, for instance, does not hesitate to denounce everything savouring of Sacramentalism and Sacerdotalism as wholly alien to Anglican belief. He thinks it possible to free Anglican formulae from their essential ambiguity and reach a fixed and clear doctrine. In the Canterbury Convocation of July, 1928, Bishop Headlam of Gloucester tried to get a committee appointed to prepare, *inter alia*, a draft statement of the teaching of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Eucharist. It was very difficult, he thought for the plain ordinary man to know what was that teaching: a sufficiently damning admission. Bishop Pollock of Norwich and others demurred. The former said—"I am all against making pronouncements. I feel that pronouncements are inherently provisional and perhaps ephemeral things." But Bishop Barnes was strongly in favour of the motion:

"At the present time [he said] it is most important that the Church should state definitely the doctrine of the Eucharist which it holds. . . . I myself think the Church should state the truth and I believe the truth regarding Sacramental doctrine can be reached. I am not content to say that there are two schools of thought within the Church which can each derive justification for their point of view from the Prayer Book. . . . I believe with regard to Sacramental doctrine we can reach such a measure of accurate knowledge that many of the statements made within our body can be definitely proved to be false."

What the Bishop thinks is the truth about Sacramental doctrine he has made abundantly clear by many frank, not to say offensive, statements, but his plea for definiteness of teaching, on a subject of such transcendent importance as the Blessed Eucharist, is the merest common sense. Still, there are two difficulties in the way of defining *anything* in Anglicanism: 1) that there is no authority capable of doing so, and 2) if there were, no one would feel bound to accept the definition! Bishop Knox, that consistent Protestant, who so often has *le mot juste*

in Anglican disputes because of his transparent honesty, not long ago put the matter in a nutshell :

"For nearly half a century, there have been within the Church of England teachers and followers of what are fundamentally two distinct religions. This situation has been recognized as scandalous by all who believe that a Church ought to teach consistent truth in all matters essential to salvation. Prayer Book revision is an attempt to solve the difficulty by legitimizing this inconsistency. The two parties are invited to say to each other : '*You may teach what I believe to be false, on condition that I may teach what you believe to be false.*' " Letter to *Daily News*, 12.1.28.

He, at any rate, does not believe in comprehensiveness. He knows that, whatever else it had done, Anglicanism has repudiated the Mass ; that, in the words of Bishop Henson of Durham :

"The English Reformation . . . became, under Edward VI., mainly theological and practical, concerned with the abolition of the Mass in which the scheme of mediæval religion had centred" ; that, as the same prelate further says :

"Neither the Elizabethan nor the Caroline revisers of the Edwardine [Prayer] Book had any other object in their work than to render the Prayer Book a more efficient expression of the Protestant Religion." *The Edinburgh Review*, April, 1924, pp. 211 and 232.

Peace, in fact, would be assured to the Anglican Church to-day, if it had the courage of its founders and openly rejected the doctrine of the Mass. The "Anglo-Catholics," those, *i.e.*, who are not Modernists, would doubtless secede, but there would be no serious differences of faith to divide the remainder. For, though direct denunciation of the Mass is avoided, the official mind of that Church, so far as it can be ascertained from episcopal utterances on the priesthood, rejects the Mass. Without a priesthood, supernaturally endowed with power directly derived from God Himself to offer the sacrifice of the New Law, there can clearly be no Mass, and to that kind of priesthood, official Anglicanism, present as well as past, lays no claim. Confining ourselves to the moderns, we find many echoes of the Augsburg Confession of Luther and Melancthon—"All the faithful are priests and can offer spiritual sacrifice to God, and there is no other priesthood or sacrifice instituted by Christ in the Church ; and the office of ministers in the Church is to preach and dispense the Sacraments, not to

offer Sacrifice." Here is the teaching of the present Archbishop of York :

"I think that if a layman "celebrates" with devout intention he effects a real consecration, and any who receive at his hands receive the Divine Gift. None the less he acts wrongly, not only because he offends against the actual rule of the Church, but because the principle of his act is destructive of the values which the ordered ministry exists to conserve, and which are an important element in a complete Christian experience." Archbishop Temple in *Christus Veritas*, p. 163 n.

That is sound Lutheran doctrine, the antithesis to Catholic belief in an official sacrificing priesthood. It is shared by Bishop David of Liverpool :

"I think that there is no doubt at all that, in the Prayer Book at present, we offer sacrifice to God in the Holy Communion. We offer first of all the sacrifice of our alms ; we offer the sacrifice of the unconsecrated elements ; we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; we offer the sacrifice of ourselves. But the offering of the consecrated elements as a sacrifice to God was deliberately cut out of the Church of England Prayer Book in 1552 and has never been restored. . . . But in our Revised Prayer Book we have this new view—or old view if you like to call it so—revived and brought back. . . . The chasuble is historically the sacrificial vestment. In bringing back into the Church of England that sacrificial vestment, you practically bring back into the Church of England the old doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass." National Assembly Report, 16.5.23, p. 58.

Holding that opinion, Bishop David sees no incongruity in welcoming Nonconformists to take part in the services of his Cathedral. They are just as well qualified to offer Protestant worship as he is. Similarly, Dr. Headlam of Gloucester, strong advocate of Protestant union at Lausanne and elsewhere, indicates in the following passage one reason for his views :

"I believe that in all these bodies which solemnly appoint their ministers by laying on of hands and prayer, and celebrate the Sacrament in accordance with our Lord's commands, the Orders and Sacraments are valid." "Doctrine of the Church," p. 268.

Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, in one of those sweeping views of Church history which he derives from his study of "Science," denies that there ever was a priesthood in the Church in the Catholic sense :

"In the intellectual decline of the last centuries of the Roman

Empire Pagan beliefs entered Christianity. A sacerdotalism grew up entirely foreign to the teaching of the New Testament. The priesthood of the laity was the dominant note of the early Church, and the Liberal Evangelical insisted that the Christian minister had no sacerdotal powers which the layman did not possess. . . . Christ was as truly present when a layman or Freechurch minister presided at Holy Communion, as when an Archbishop took the service." *Birmingham Post*, 22.1.25.

Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrew's brings us the witness of the past generation. Speaking at the Church Congress of 1890, he said :

"At the Reformation, the Mass with its doctrine of sacrifice and adoration was given up and the Holy Communion introduced. Nothing else will account for the universal disuse of the position [of a priest at Mass] formerly used. The change was made on principle."

A few years later, Bishop Ryle, who became Dean of Westminster after having been Bishop of Liverpool, stated the Anglican position as against the Catholic, with admirable clearness :

"Our manner of conceiving the office of a minister of Christ is very different from that of the Pope. On the one hand, the ecclesiastic of the Roman Church is a true priest whose principal duty is to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. On the other hand, the ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church is in no wise a priest, although we call him such; he is only an elder whose principal office is, not to sacrifice, but rather to preach the Word of God and to administer the Sacraments." *Guardian*, 4.11.96.

And the same Prelate, whilst still, we believe, Bishop of Liverpool, described with even greater emphasis, the purpose and performance of his spiritual ancestors thus :

"The Reformers found the Sacrifice of the Mass in our Church. They cast it out as a 'blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit' and called the Lord's Supper a Sacrament. . . . The Reformers found altars in all our churches. They ordered them to be taken down, cast the word 'altar' entirely out of our Prayer Book and spoke only of the Lord's Table and the Lord's Board. . . . The Reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests and made them [that is, those set in their places] prayer-reading, preaching ministers of God's Word and Sacraments. . . . The Reformers found in our Church a doctrine of a Real Corporal Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, under the forms of bread and wine, and laid down their lives to oppose it. They would not even allow

the expression 'real presence' a place in our Prayer Book." "What do we owe to the Reformation?" p. 19.

Bishop Hensley Henson always states whatever views he holds for the time being with the greatest lucidity. We have no recent pronouncements of his on this particular topic, but some score years ago, when Bishop of Hereford, he declared in the best Protestant style :

"The kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial class between God and man, no class by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man forgiven. . . . And this absence of any Sacerdotal Order from the Christian Church, rightly understood, is deserving of all the more careful attention because of the tendency in a section of our Church of England to drift back towards the erroneous and misleading Roman doctrine of a Sacrificing Priesthood." Quoted in *Tablet*, 13.2.09, p. 247.

According to those eminent authorities—and many more might be quoted, without leaving the ranks of the Episcopate—there is no difference in sacramental character between the Anglican clergyman and the Nonconformist minister. Bishop David of Liverpool already foresees the time when the distinction will be abolished by law :

"It may be that we are being led into a new conception of establishment altogether. Those who have ears to hear the challenge to reunion, which comes through Jerusalem from the native Churches of the Far East, may ask themselves whether the Established Church of the future may not be so devised as to provide for the inclusion of some of the Free Churches on terms which they could accept." Diocesan Leaflet, quoted in *Times*, 2.8.28.

Moreover, Bishop Headlam of Gloucester does not see why the Free Church should submit to Anglican ordination, even for the sake of unity. He writes thus :

"Nonconformists say : 'We think it would be untrue to our calling if we submit to any re-ordination.' I think they are quite right. We Anglican clergy would not accept any form of re-ordination for the sake of reunion with the Eastern Church or the Church of Rome, and we have no right to ask it of others." "The Church of England," p. 140.

All this we submit is in the best Anglican tradition. The Elizabethan reformers intended and produced a complete break with the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, the Sacrificial Priesthood and the Real Objective Presence.¹ The glosses

¹ In Dom Norbert Birt's "The Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth" (C.T.S.) will be found a valuable and unanswerable catena of passages, denouncing Mass, Priesthood and Real Presence, culled—an evil-smelling bouquet—from the first reformers.

and speculations of later Anglican Divines, trying to regain what was so deliberately thrown overboard, as also the modern efforts of the "Anglo-Catholics," are all to no purpose. These latter are tolerated in Anglicanism, partly because there is no machinery for turning them out of that body, partly because they have become too strong to be dealt with by force. Besides, the show of comprehensiveness must be kept up, and so we find various Bishops praising them for their particular contribution to the sum of Anglican truth. Whereas we have Bishop Barnes saying to his Church Council—"I urge that those of your Council who desire Roman Catholic uses, based on the erroneous doctrine of Transubstantiation, should join the Roman Church," and Bishop Burroughs calling them cuckoos in the Anglican nest, Bishop Ingram of London rebukes Lord Brentford for wishing to drive out "those to whose work and devotion we owe so much." "We need," the Bishop cries in the same letter (v. MONTH, June, p. 529) "that firm hold of sacramental truth which the Anglo-Catholics give." Other examples of episcopal tolerance were quoted in our second article; the innate Protestantism of the Establishment, in deference to its boast of comprehensiveness but in contradiction to its own traditions, giving the "ugly duckling" a reluctant share with its own native brood. The straitened fortunes of the State Church, now shrunk to less than a tenth of the nation, make such a course desirable, the utter religious apathy of the public makes it possible; the indifference of the State itself makes it safe.

The result is that instead of the clear-cut repudiation of Catholic Eucharistic doctrine characteristic of the founders of Anglicanism,—an intelligible act in a body that professed to be guided solely by reason in the long run,—the modern Church authorities can offer only a selection of theories, leaving their flocks to pick and choose. A Conference on Eucharistic Doctrine, lately held at King's College by representatives of "different schools of thought," issued to the press on July 2nd the following provisional statement of belief in this matter, which comes very opportunely to clinch our contentions in this paper, and which, as Archbishop Temple, who introduces it, very prudently remarks, "makes no claim to theological precision":

"We are all agreed that Christ is truly present in the Holy Communion. All find this Presence in the sacred action generally, and in the souls of the faithful receivers. Some also find it speci-

ally in such association with the consecrated Elements that it is fitly spoken of as vouchsafed in or through them; others do not find it in any special association with the Elements apart from reception. (There are also various interpretations intermediate between these two.) But all are agreed that both [?] of these interpretations can legitimately be held within the Church of England.

Further, all are agreed that the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is 'after an heavenly and spiritual manner'; that He is spiritually to be received, and that 'the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith'; and all are agreed that Our Blessed Lord is always and everywhere present to His faithful people, and not through the Sacrament of the Eucharist only.

It is important that all should avoid mistaken views of what is held by those with whom they disagree; thus, for example, it should not be thought that any instructed Christian believes in a material Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, whether or not he professes belief in the 'Real Presence'; or again, those who do not conceive of the Presence of Christ as specially associated with the Elements apart from reception are not to be supposed to regard the Holy Communion as a memorial only; all schools of thought are agreed in holding that Christ is spiritually present in the Eucharist.

We appeal to our fellow-Churchmen to recognize the wide measures of agreement here expressed, (!) and also to recognize that it quite definitely includes agreement to differ in the interpretation of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as set forth above, until, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we are united in a fuller apprehension of the truth."

When one thinks of what is at issue—to discern and express the intention of God Incarnate in instituting the Eucharist—this jumble of ambiguous theories, even less clear than the Articles themselves, solemnly set forth as illustrating "the agreement which exists between various schools of thought" seems a hollow mockery. The only agreement discernible is the perfectly general one expressed in the first sentence, if we except "the agreement to differ" naïvely expressed in the last. These good and earnest men seem utterly oblivious of the effect that their announcement must have on their followers. The Blessed Eucharist according to Catholic doctrine is the very core and centre of the Church's worship, and the most efficacious means of grace. If Christ is not offered in sacrifice in the Mass, is not actually present under the appearances of the duly consecrated species, then, indeed, the Catholic

world, in the vigorous language of the homily, "has been plunged in damnable idolatry" for countless generations. Yet this is precisely left in doubt for the Anglican "faithful." According to this agreement, all that an Anglican teacher can now say is—"My view is so and so : I believe it is correct ; but the opposite is equally tenable in our Church ; so you must settle for yourself. Unfortunately, if you settle wrongly, you will be either committing idolatry or misusing God's highest gift."

After nigh on two thousand years of Christianity, here is a *soi-disant* Christian Church, professedly unable to decide what to believe about the most momentous of its doctrines. This is the sorry result of making a pretence of authority, which the Church of Christ must have, yet in reality walking by human reason alone. No one can teach unless he be sent by someone who guarantees his mission. Anglicanism has no guarantee.

We have examined the clash of principles, the contradictions in doctrine, which the utterances of its Bishops abundantly exhibit. Our portfolio is by no means exhausted, but there is little need to pursue the enquiry under other heads. Otherwise we could show wide diversity on such cardinal points as the Divinity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the authority of the Bible, as also on various moral questions. The ultimate problem suggested by the enquiry must surely be this,—if an ecclesiastical Body cannot teach with authority, nor worship with certainty, what real claim has it to belong to the Church of Christ ?

JOSEPH KEATING.

CLEAR ETHICS AND LOOSE LANGUAGE

ONE of our initial difficulties in the fight against modern pseudo-science and materialism, especially in the spheres of inexact science such as eugenics, sociology, and economics, lies in the fact that the enemy has chosen the weapons. He has coined a new vocabulary which gives him many advantages, but it does so only if we are so ill-advised as to use it—if we will try to fight him with his own weapons. The new pseudo-scientific language is not substantially better than ours; in fact, it has its chief advantage in this, that it gives the enemy the air of having discovered something new, of being progressive and up-to-date, merely because it enables him to call old things by new names. Most of the new ideas of the modern psychologist, for example, were sifted centuries ago by the scholastics. This air of novelty appeals to the "news-sense" of the Press; the jargon is an effective one for publicity. Full advantage is thus taken of the ignorance of the public; an ignorance all the worse for its smattering of literacy gained in the official schools.

It is natural, therefore, to attack modern nescience in its own language because it is the language most widely used, though not so widely understood. But it is a mistake. In effect, it concedes the citadel to the enemy, his defences ready made, leaving the attackers the burden of formulating tactics and strategy to meet the new state of war. We are foolish if in this circumstance we use the defenders' weapons, which are new and cheaply forged, rather than our own which are old and well tried. The language of the enemy, his weapon, is a bad one, especially for us, because it is not exact. It relies a good deal on double meaning and does not often mean what it says. "Birth-control" for "Birth-prevention" is a ready instance, "alcohol" for "wine" or "beer" is another. It frequently begs the question, as in its constant appeals to "Progress." It is variously interpreted even by its masters. We had far better stick to our own and insist on fighting the battle of Christian morality with plain English words and careful logic.

I am moved to these observations by an example of the matter in the Introduction to the current Catholic Social Guild Year Book, which is an admirable guide for the Catholic in regard to the whole question of State aided hygiene, written by an eminent Catholic physician, Dr. L. D. Fairfield. It is far from my intention to criticize the distinguished and respected writer of the Introduction, who has a practical work of immense social utility to his credit. If my analysis appears an impertinence it is certainly not so intended. I have a profound respect for the writer and his very great service to humanity. I hope he will forgive me for saying that I cannot believe that he meant what certain passages in his Introduction seem to imply. The paradox arises, in my humble opinion, from his use of the language of the enemy.

After justly criticizing the modern eugenist's argument for birth-prevention, that it enables us to have fewer children better brought up and so improve the quality of the race, he goes on to say :

Already there is proof of the falsity of this eugenic doctrine. *Our worst breeding-stocks, those who, speaking generally, on account of lower mentality and physical inefficiency have sunk to the slums, are as prolific as ever; our best breeding-stocks, the middle-classes, whose success in life is due to their higher abilities, are becoming increasingly barren. The last survey shows that as a consequence the proportion of mental defect in the nation is undoubtedly rising.*

Now, the language of this quotation is the language of the enemy. It is the way the eugenist talks. The sentiments might be those of the Dean of St. Paul's, although if he were giving an example of our worst breeding-stocks, they would, of course, be described as Irish as well as poor. Nevertheless, the sentiments as they stand are essentially middle-class sentiments, such as the eugenist, who is himself middle-class, habitually uses. The whole quotation, owing to the wrong use of language, is compact of social error and many other deplorable things beside. Let us consider it in detail.

Breeding-stock as such, to continue for the moment in the manner of the quotation—biologically and animally— may be judged on three main counts, "fecundity," "prolificacy," and "prepotency"; that is, its ability to breed at all, the extent to which it breeds, and the extent to which it impresses its own

character on its progeny. On none of these counts can the lower-classes, even of the slums, be counted the worst. If the physical desirability of the stock be reckoned as a measure of the value of the breeding-stock, then there is no doubt that the lower-classes are better built, more hardy, and more powerful than any other. If the moral measure of value is to be made, it would be a very bold man who would say that the middle-classes or the upper-classes are *inherently* more virtuous than the slum dwellers. If we are going to say that one class is morally *better breeding-stock* than another, we must say that virtue is *inherited*. Physically, in qualities that are unquestionably inherent, there is no doubt that the lower-classes are better. Only if we measure the value of human breeding-stock by the amount it is paid for its work, or the extent to which it has ceased to use its hands and strength, can we give any class a superiority over the lower-classes as breeding-stock.

The lower-classes are presumed to have "sunk to the slums." If we are writing as sociologists or historians, it would be far more true to fact to say that the slums have been imposed upon the lower-classes. There is no evidence that a large proportion of slum-dwellers have once been, either themselves or their families, in a higher social grade. We have always had the poor with us. Most of them are bred of long generations of manual-working men and women. Therefore, there can be no question of their having sunk. They have their natural habitat at the material bottom of the social scale.

It is obvious that the hefty labouring man, even if he is one who has *sunk*, has not sunk through the "*physical inefficiency*" of himself or his stock. The physically inefficient of the middle-classes only rarely sink into the slums. Most of them manage very well in the professions, where physical efficiency is not essential to success, and those who cannot do so are cared for by their relatives. For the workers to make, "generally speaking," breeding-stock of any sort in the stratum where competition is keenest and the principle of the survival of the fittest operates most actively, is clearly absurd. It might be conceded that lower mentality could be a possible cause of the *glissade* from the middle-classes to the lower, but we should have to add, in fairness, as another series of possible causes,—honesty, contempt for over-reaching, despising of this world's goods for their own sake, a natural

humility, even an affection for the Lady Poverty. There are many poor who are poor for these causes. The Successful and the Go-getters in their arrogance condemn them for lack of ambition and the Will to Get On. Must they, therefore, be classed with those of "lower mentality"?

Then it is lamented that these worst breeding-stocks of the slums, however they have got there, are as *prolific as ever*, though prolificacy should be a virtue in breeding-stock. On the contrary they are not as prolific as ever. No classes in England are as prolific as ever. The birth-rate in England is decelerating rapidly in all classes. The slums are not excepted. The pernicious propaganda of the advocates of artificial birth-prevention has penetrated the slummiest slum. The "Wisdom of the Age" is now accessible equally to the Duchess and the Drab.

So much for the physical and biological aspect of the matter. Socially speaking, it is by no means indisputable that the middle-classes, as breeders, produce the most useful members of the community. They work less than the lower-classes in point of time, a considerable proportion does not work at all,—the early retired, the independent, and the various dependants which are found attached to most middle-class families. Parasitism, though it be involuntary and inevitable, is hardly a quality of superiority. Those of the middle-classes who "earn their livings," that is, the majority, do so fairly easily, and their social value, measured in the usefulness of their work to the community, is in many cases not high. For example, those who are stockbrokers, advertising experts, entertainment caterers, in the intervals between golf or fishing, form a not inconsiderable proportion of the middle-classes. A vast amount of the work of those employed in banks, insurance offices, and administrative capacities in industry and the State, is of very doubtful value to the community. It is not impossible that they may be a burden on the producers of necessities. Their work is not directly productive of necessities, and very much of it is not even indirectly productive.

The only measure of superiority as breeding-stock which remains in favour of the middle-classes is that of their incomes. They are best because they breed the best people, namely, those who will possess the most money. Not a very high standard of quality. But it is the standard of the eugenist.

It is difficult to imagine what is the "*success in life*" attributed in our quotation to the middle-classes. Except in rare

cases the members of the middle-classes do no more than succeed in remaining in the stratum into which they were born. The slum dwellers do that equally well. There is no question of the success of the middle-classes in competition with the lower-classes, because there is not, in the main, any competition between them. Where there is competition, (in public examinations, for example), the lower-classes win as often as not. Most of the members of our Socialist Government are from the lower-classes; nor did they commence with the advantage of the family influence or wealth of their opponents. The "higher abilities" of the middle-classes are as mythical as the "lower mentality" of the lower-classes. Any higher ability which may be observed in the middle-classes is not specially *inherent* in them; few successful men are succeeded by equally successful sons, and therefore this does not affect their value as breeding-stock. Progress is due to the development of ability, a quality which exists equally in the lower-classes. The "lower mentality" attributed to the lower-classes is mostly due to lack of development. The lower-class man, when he emerges, is often more than equal to the middle-class man, as witness again the Socialist politician and the ubiquitous *parvenu*. Even the criminal belongs to all classes, and may make himself at home in any. Though risen from the slums he can outwit the middle-class criminologist, in spite of his birth-handicap.

It is true that the middle-classes are becoming "increasingly barren," and, so far, are assuredly not the "best breeding-stock." The increasing barrenness is due to more than physical decline. It gives a new meaning to the Basque description of a man that he has "sold his shadow to the devil." The phrase applied to the intellectual, who is notoriously unprolific, and it arose from the idea that a man had sold his power to beget progeny, the shadow that should follow him, to the devil for knowledge and wisdom beyond the common wit of man. The modern middle-classes analogically sell their shadows to the devil for ease of circumstances, for the leisure and luxury which children would absorb. It is an even less intelligent bargain than the intellectual was supposed to make. For wisdom may beget even worldly goods; leisure and luxury, for which the same price is paid, beget nothing—unless, in the language of the ascetics, it is Sin.

The last sentence of the quotation which I have had the temerity thus to examine, appears to be a generalization, and

must be treated as such until detailed evidence is brought to support it. I will not question that the proportion of mental defect in the nation is undoubtedly rising, but it is difficult to imagine what sort of survey can show that it does so *as a consequence of the greater prolificacy of the lower-classes*. The proportion of mental defectives amongst the poor is well known. It would be very difficult for a mental defective who is poor to escape the official eye. A little mental defect goes a long way with a zealous official. The records of the poor are carefully kept. On the other hand, the middle-class mental defective must be very defective indeed before he is "put away," or even brought to official notice. Middle-class children are not subjected to the same severe and regular observations and tests. I make bold to suspect that even the known proportion of mental defectives in the middle-classes is high enough to challenge the generalization, though I here speak without my book. The writer whose quotation we are considering does in fact contradict the implication of his statement a few lines further on: "*If all the mental defectives in the country to-day were sterilized, the effect upon the next generation would be inappreciable. Only a small proportion of mental defectives are derived from mentally defective stock.*"

Thus, in a publication of the Catholic Social Guild, which was created to be a shield against social error and a sword against social evil, we have confusion worse confounded. The cause, we repeat, is certainly not the incapacity or inexperience of the writer, but most certainly is it his use of the cloudy language of the enemy, his attempt to meet the enemy with the enemy's weapons, which collapse in his hand. I have taken an isolated quotation but there are other instances in his Preface of the same defect. For instance,—"*The present age is characterized by a new and sympathetic understanding of the needs of childhood*"; which means that the State, having allowed for generations industrial conditions to which the rights of poor children were grossly sacrificed, is now trying to undo the effects of its past neglect.

The trouble is that the writer, imbued with the highest motives and an intense desire to counteract the evils which the present age has inflicted upon childhood by its neglect and callous exploitation during the past century, uses in his view of social problems the arrogant and question-begging language of the modern eugenicist, who has neither the Christian love for children nor devotion to their service. The eugenicist is essen-

tially materialist and scientific. He is not concerned with children with souls, but with population and race in scientific aspects. The writer whom I have quoted repudiates the eugenist most strongly. Would that he had repudiated as completely the use of the eugenist's language which so abounds in fallacies. I have met the same drawback in the *Christian Democrat*, the organ of the Guild, and in the discussions in which I have been permitted to join at the Catholic Workers' College. It appears to be taken for granted that in discussing social problems we must speak the language, and with the language imbibe the preconceptions, of the pundits on the other side.

If we are to approach an understanding of social problems we cannot afford to increase confusion by the use of modern catchphrases. Least of all, can we afford to use the inaccurate language of those who are philosophically opposed to us. Many of us who certainly do (I had nearly said "must") agree fundamentally are led to misunderstand one another by nothing more than confusion of language. It is in an attempt to clear up some of the confusion that exists that I have made bold to analyze the writing of one abler, wiser, and better than myself. And on that alone rests my hope of pardon.

G. C. HESELTINE.

THE CALL OF THE NEAR EAST

IN a recent article¹ we spoke about Catholic Copts in Egypt. Immense gratitude was expressed for that article to the Editor of *THE MONTH*, because of his far-sightedness in regarding his Magazine as no local or territorial publication merely, but as one which seeks to interest the Catholics of England in what lies beyond their national outlook. I acknowledge that the "Catholic Survey," published by the Catholic Council for International Relations (74 Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1), is the proper place for finding out what Catholics are doing (or suffering) in other lands; but while that bulletin has to exclude home-news, it would be wrong of *THE MONTH* or any magazine calling itself Catholic, to exclude information about overseas. And even though the Association for the Propagation of the Faith and some other small magazines be directly concerned with Missions, it certainly belongs to a periodical like *THE MONTH* to raise general questions, to excite interest at large—all sorts of circumstances may determine an individual to fix his attention on this or that distant territory where men and women of his own blood are labouring for Christ: but what is absolutely certain is, that English Catholics have no right to limit their horizon to this island, nor to disregard their *DUTY* (we print it in capitals) towards other parts of the world.

At present, the Test Matches occupy more space, and arouse more emotion, than India or Egypt do. We are not uninterested in the Test Matches! In fact, knowing one or two of the Australians, we periodically send them postcards wishing them luck. But when not occupied with writing postcards, whose abbreviations we hope are intelligible, we are praying with anxiety (not that prayer ever should be anxious) for certain other lands.

In this article, we do not profess to offer more than "snippets." We had these in our possession before we encountered the absurd experience of not being very well, and of having to obey steel-wristed nurses. The most we can do is to agglutinate certain items that we had accumulated.

A most important document was issued in September, 1928,

¹ *THE MONTH*, July, 1930, p. 43.

consisting of the ideas and wishes of the Holy Father concerning the East. It can be obtained from the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, Piazza Santa Maria Maggiore 7, Rome. I earnestly hope that its salient passages will be circulated by the Society for the Maintenance of the Holy See as were those of the Encyclical on Education, perhaps in conjunction with the Society of St. John Chrysostom. The translation of the papal document is unusually excellent; in fact, perfect. The foreword is brief and to the point.

It reminds us that 150,000,000 Christians in the near East are almost identical with the Catholic Church in their religious beliefs. They are just outside the fold, just outside the door. They are not, as those of heretical religions, in a distant land with a long journey between them and the home they have left.

Union with them would not mean a paring down of beliefs into a practically beliefless religion—a minimum common-denominator. Unity would mean the sacred preservation of their immense inherited treasure of faith and a return to the few ancient beliefs which they were unfortunately led to abandon.

May the reaper of this harvest not be the energetic, powerfully organized Soviet atheism. Already it is intensely busy in the field with all the zeal of revolutionists, with all the power that a propagandist government can give it. Already, it has carried away thousands of sheaves that should have been gathered into the granaries of Christ.

In the above mentioned document the Pope says that the Holy See has *always* been convinced that numerous evils in the past in the near East "were the necessary results, above all, of *mutual* ignorance and contempt and of the prejudices consequent on long enduring aversion. It realized that it would be vain to seek a cure of such great evils unless their causes were removed."

The Holy Father then recalls a few out of the very many instances of the Holy See's solicitude for the East; he mentioned (what few of us knew) that the Franciscan, St. Bonaventure, and the Dominican, St. Thomas Aquinas, were both summoned by Gregory X. to the Council of Lyons, so deeply concerned with oriental matters, and that the former died on his way there and the latter in the midst of the arduous work incumbent on the Council; and he goes so far as to say that in the Councils of Ferrara and Florence "easily the most eminent participants were those glories of the Eastern Orient, Bessarion of Nicea and Isidor of Kieff." The Pope says that

Councils must of their nature be rare : but there has been an "uninterrupted series," and "continual flow," of good will and loving activity from Rome towards the East, and then almost startlingly enumerates the earnest efforts of Rome, by means not least of the Dominicans and Franciscans, to develop a proper knowledge of Greek and of oriental languages, entirely previous to and independently of that Renaissance to which an absurdly disproportionate credit has been given and which was far more imitative than creative. After dwelling on the activity of Humbert de Romanis, O.P., the Holy Father mentions Roger Bacon, "the learned and dear friend of Our Predecessor, Clement IV., who not only eruditely wrote about the Chaldean, Arabic and Greek languages but also lectured on them"; and then, with more "characterization" than is usual in papal documents, tells how Raymond de Lull, "with his characteristic impetuosity," obtained from Celestine V. and Boniface VIII. much that was considered "exceptional for the times" concerning both preliminary study, and actual giving of Missions, not only among schismatics but among Saracens, Tartars and other pagans !

The next paragraph I must quote in its entirety.

Still more memorable is the decree formulated in the Council of Vienne through the initiative of the same Raymond of Lull and promulgated by Our Predecessor, Clement V., in which We can see a foreshadowing of Our Oriental Institute : "With the approval of this Sacred Council We have provided for the erection of schools in the languages mentioned below, wherever the Roman Curia shall happen to reside, and in Paris, Oxford, Bologna and Salamanca, requiring that in each of those places there be Catholic professors possessing a suitable knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Arabic and Chaldean,—that is, two experts in each tongue, who shall direct the schools there, shall translate the books of those languages into Latin, shall carefully teach others and thus transmit their own knowledge to following generations."

The disturbed state of the East prevented the Pontiffs from doing much work in Asia itself ; so they did their best by erecting colleges in Rome for Armenians, Ruthenians, Maronites and Greeks, and the services thus rendered to archæology and literature are incalculable. The Pope, then, insisting once more that "mutual charity and esteem" be-

tween Orient and Occident would be furthered by *our* understanding the East more correctly, brings matters down to the period of quite modern Popes—Gregory XVI., Pius IX. (especially in view of the Vatican Council), Leo XIII. (especially as regards the Copts and the Slavs, and in the matter of the Beyrouth University), Pius X., by his foundation of the Biblical Institute. Benedict XV., however, perfectly well saw that there was here an inadequacy or an overlapping, for Biblical and Oriental interests are not identical. He founded therefore, a Congregation for Oriental Rites and Affairs, and an Institute for Higher Oriental Studies in Rome. The present Pontiff, judging the new Institute ill-placed, removed it almost at once to the house of the Biblical Institute, effecting thus temporarily an immense economy, since though, as I said, the two sets of interests are not identical, they do largely overlap, and easy consultation across and across, is useful.

The Pope then makes an appeal. He recalls that in various parts of Europe and in America all sorts of discussions "of the greatest importance" concerning Eastern groups both schismatic and in union with Rome have taken place; so far is he from using the rather supercilious tone which we sometimes do. I think that supercilious aloofness is due to our having got our principles strong and right, but having our sheer information still under-nourished, so that we confront these events with minds vacuous as to detail and with no interest. The Pope himself insists that, while Catholic students are happily well equipped to perceive and refute the errors of Protestantism in all branches, "in most cases" they cannot judge exactly about the customs of the East nor "its legitimate rites which are to be sacredly respected in the unity of Catholicism." The Pope, therefore, appeals to Ordinaries to provide at least one student who, himself an expert, can teach even in an elementary way what concerns the Orient to seminarians and others, mentioning how not only Paris, Louvain and Lille have, among Catholic universities, done this, but that other places have too, "often at public expense." Again, the Pope, harping on a string not much used by ourselves, insists that the Western Clergy will thus understand "more adequately Catholic Theology and Latin Discipline," and "conceive a more ardent love for the true Spouse of Christ, whose enchanting loveliness in the diversity of rites they would thus perceive in greater wealth and splendour." Indeed, so rapidly have things moved, that the Pope can already con-

template moving the Oriental Institute once more to a house of its own on the Esquiline where large donations, chiefly from America and Spain, will make possible the equipment of proper buildings and a proper library. The Holy Father frankly alludes to his experience collected both from his years in the Ambrosian and in the Vatican libraries, constituting him an ideal judge of what is wanted to equip the ideal library. For its development, he asks for gifts in money or in kind (MSS., books, etc.).

He then mentions the kind of teaching given in the Institute, delightedly emphasizing the Islamic section, a new phenomenon in Rome. Its Professor of Islamic Languages and Literature, Mgr. Mehemet Ali Mulla Zadé, headed the Pontifical Mission to the 17th International Congress of Oriental Studies at Oxford nearly two years ago.¹ The *Orientalia Christiana*, consisting of the publications of the Institute on all imaginable topics connected with (usually) the Nearer East, must already be of supreme value to non-Catholic specialists, who in this country probably have not heard of it, according to the principle: *Catholica non leguntur*.

The Pope reiterates his request for help from all sides, that the Orient may return "not only in some individual cases but their entirety" (a phrase no Pontiff has ever been able, alas, to use about this land), to union with the Holy See, because after all, it has "sacredly preserved such a large part of divine revelation, manifests such a sincere devotion to Christ Our Lord, fosters a remarkable love and attachment to His Immaculate Mother, and enjoys the real performance and reception of the Sacraments." These words are almost as important for what they do not say as for what they do.²

So often have I heard: "But there is enough to do at home. Why worry about foreign missions *at all*?" To that, the sufficient answer is: "Go; teach *all* nations." To this, in effect, is replied: "Well, let someone else do it; don't ask me." That is the old answer—"Am I my brother's keeper?"

¹ Born in Crete of Turkish ancestry, his mother being descended from an Egyptian viceroy, he was trained as a Mohammedan, joined a school of Turkish mysticism, and after going to France for further education became Christian, Catholic, priest and is now prelate.

² As from Jan. 1930, the *Orientalia Christiana* publishes its volumes 4 times a year. Since its object is information and not profit, a volume costs 25 Italian lire—about half or a quarter of what similar publications do. Apply to Pontifical Institute for Oriental Studies, Piazza S. M. Maggiore 7, Roma, 128. Since some of the remoter articles are out of print, we hope that the more permanently important may be saved from this calamity and volumes be published and republished containing them as well as the more substantial of the new ones.

—an answer, because it really was an assertion: "I am not." But Cain was! And when we, as a race, began to "moralize" our Eastward behaviour, we welcomed phrases like "the white man's burden"; and gradually Kipling (whom I have been re-reading) developed, it seems to me, almost a Catholic way of thinking about other nations, much as my saying so might surprise him. His book "Kim," already displayed a very new way of thinking about Orientals and their ideals. The kindly contempt, or the geniality displayed by the army, coupled with a taking it for granted that they were dealing with an inferior race; and the puzzled (when honest, not ambitious) civilian (viceroys included), were far from the rascal brutality of merchants: but Rudyard Kipling, with encouragement, might not only have gone much further, but have led our country so to think, so to hope, concerning India that we might never be in our present muddle, wherein our rulers, men of more theories and infinitely less experience than their predecessors, make it quite plain that they have not any clear idea what to do next. But India is not the "near East," nor will I speak of it; besides, my ignorance of it is too great: my ideas, mostly from a source once certainly unexceptionable, may be now out of date.

England recently accepted a "mandate" as regards Palestine. If I thought that the general lack of interest in this fact was really due to our disapproving of our having done so, I would feel happier, because it would be a real judgment, implying the application of intelligence to a fact, and a decision of the will. I fear I think the apathy is due to our just not being interested in distant places. I suppose that less impression was made in England by British soldiers in khaki having to keep order in the church of the Holy Sepulchre than was made in France. We have not carefully weighed the relative rights of Arab and of Jew in Palestine; we simply cannot begin to understand the passions annually unchained in the church built over the place where Christ was crucified and buried. When, in 1917, Lord Balfour wrote his Letter to Lord Rothschild about "a national home" for Jews in Palestine, most people knew by instinct that it was a politico-military gesture—the Jews just then had to be propitiated: when Dr. Weizmann in 1919 expressed the ideal that Palestine should be just as Jewish as England was English, the Arab grumble rose into a growl, and Britain's "explanation" in 1921 satisfied nobody—no wonder. It had no meaning.

Zionism meanwhile had moved at first enthusiastically, so that in 1919 to 1921 there had been 19,863 Jewish immigrants, and presumably no emigrants; in 1922 there were 7,844 immigrants and 1,503 emigrants, and in 1927 2,178 immigrants and 5,071 emigrants (Jewish, of course). Without doubt, the various Governments are beginning to give up in despair the question of Arab v. Jew in Palestine, if ever they intended seriously to occupy themselves with it. But we British Catholics, who are Catholics and also citizens, have also remained uninterested, and this in spite of the appeal made by the Cardinal at the Liverpool Catholic Congress in 1920 (v. MONTH, September, 1920), that Catholics should do their utmost to counteract the evil of Zionism. I hardly dare ask how many of us help the Guild of Sion whose centre is the Convent of Our Lady of Sion, Chepstow Villas, Bayswater, London, W.; but I now hear with anguish of the shutting up of the *only* English Catholic enterprise in Palestine, the Settlement and Weaving School opened at Bethlehem by the C.W.L., herein more far-sighted, more courageous, more pious, than any of us. It has been explained to me that they "could no other." Impossible to interest English Catholics in Catholic work in Palestine. France and Italy (for reasons which we will not discuss) do something. Protestant England, and to an enormously greater degree, non-Catholic America (U.S.A.), do an incredible amount. I have asked two or three times for an official account of non-Catholic American enterprise in Palestine. "Impossible," I am told, "to keep pace with it." I add, that Catholics, working as amateurs with the noblest motives but the minimum of training, are not the best people from whom to invite statistics. However, I have before me a letter from one who was Governor of Bethlehem and Assistant Governor of Galilee at Nazareth, who insists that he could "testify to every word I say." I do not ask his help: it would not be fair to *him*. Such personalities ought not to be invoked. In spite of his possessing 60 slides of his own making, concerned with Palestine, and in spite of his offer to lecture free on any subject connected with the general one, and in spite of the complete lack of interest which his offers met with among priests and laity, I consider it not my business to advertise him. I consider that England has lost her Catholic chance; and that Jerusalem (which Lord Allenby treated with true profound reverence, owing to his own instinct, I think, and also, I believe, to the recommendation of the highest

authority of all in our Empire) will become a place of cinemas, postcard-shops, etc., surrounding that interesting local attraction, Calvary.

Well, we may be able to shovel off India, Egypt and Palestine, from our conscience; but our Missions in Africa we cannot. God helping me, if indeed I am sent to S. Africa this winter, I will devote what time I can to describing them. (Not that Catholics lack material for knowing about them.) It is a delight to me, just now, to know that a statue of St. Joseph at the Nsambya convent in Uganda is surrounded with "sweet-smelling pink oleander" because I managed to get someone to send a little money—not for the convent's development, but for its sheer upkeep. I like to hear of the nuns driving their dilapidated car over impossible roads to get their jobs done. I like to hear about the destitute priest who gave a nun one pound towards her needed sum of £6,000, so that she now has "only £5,999 to ask for." I smile to hear of the priests whose mission was recently burnt out and now have to reside in some corner of a maternity hospital, of all places. . . . I open my whole heart with glee when I hear of a group of small Ugandists who were shown a photo of themselves. One small boy recognized the lot, except one. It was himself—but *he had never seen a looking-glass*;—"I don't know him: never seen him." I mention but one or two names—Mother M. Magdalene, O.S.F., Nsambya Hospital, Kampala P.O., Box 246, Uganda, B.E.A.; and I add extracts from a letter from Mother M. Kevin, O.S.F., Convent of Our Lady Queen of Peace; Nkokonjeru, Lugazi P.O., Uganda, B.E.A.;

On my return to Uganda after my two years' absence in the interests of the new foundation—the Missionary Novitiate for Uganda, located at Holme Hall, Yorks,—I notice how much our missions here have suffered. Some of the existing buildings are dangerously awry, and most of the hospital huts are about to bid one another adieu. . .

Regular contributions in the way of adoptions either of a native novice at £10 a year or a child at £2 a year relieve us of much responsibility and worry. There are some dark spots on the pages of my memory. They represent lost opportunities, lost for want of means to take advantage of them. Little children whom we have been forced to refuse. Sometimes they have come of their own accord; the only Catholic, perhaps, in the little hut which is all they have to call "home." Pagans, Moham-

medans, Protestants—men, women and children; goats, chickens and sheep, there find shelter, all together. It is a cause of wonder to us that faith and virtue can stand the examples of a household so mixed, yet the little Catholic tries to hold on to the gift of God and persevere in the practice of its teaching. It seems impossible; yet along comes the child to beg us to allow it to remain at the mission. Think what it means to us, who know so well the evil surroundings, to have to refuse, because we have no house to accommodate them and no fund on which to draw. Last year we put up a wattle-and-daub building with a grass roof to accommodate about 30, the best we could do with the money at our disposal. Last month the roof collapsed, and had there been any children inside, some would have been killed. Such buildings are really a waste of money, here where storms are so terrific, but to build a decent brick house with an iron roof we need a sum of £200. Until this is forthcoming, our little boarders are huddled up together in a grass hut. Snakes abound and gain easy access. The children live in terror, as indeed they well might, as death results within a quarter of an hour from the bite of one of the more venomous kind. And still they prefer to stay at the mission. One cannot but be enamoured of these gentle natives, their wonderful indrawing of Divine Grace, their heroism in braving storms and distances—and snakes—to practise their holy religion.

M. M. Kevin,
Franciscan Missionaries of Mary.

I confess that the end of my article has taken me very far from its beginning. However, may God guide us whither He will. My chief desire is that each Catholic should be "eaten up with zeal" for God's House; and that he or she should be guided to assist that part of that "many-mansioned" dwelling-place that God may will.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

"EVOLUTION" OUT OF DATE.

IT was one of a number of signs of the hopeless confusion into which Anglican theology has fallen that about the time of Sir Arthur Keith's Presidential Address on the subject of evolution, at the 1927 meeting of the British Association, the evolutionary views expressed by certain clergymen should have been declared by the then Archbishop of Canterbury to form part of the allowed doctrine in the English Church. These views, we were told, had long been familiar to educated people who found no difficulty in reconciling them with the Christian faith. The process of reconciliation, we fancy, would not leave much of Christianity. Dr. Barnes, for instance, is of opinion that "Darwin's triumph has destroyed the whole theological scheme"—an alarming assertion till we reflect that Dr. Barnes's reverence for Darwin is old-fashioned, and that modern Darwinians are a good deal more cautious than the Victorians. In fact, there is a growing number who, like the writer of one of the volumes of the "International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method" are convinced that "the enthusiasm with which Darwinians advocate the idea of evolution has something absurd in it"¹ (J. Von Uexküll, "Theoretical Biology," p. 264). The real scientists are discussing the lately-found Pekin skull, using their geological, anatomical, and palæontological knowledge with due circumspection, but Dr. Barnes already knows all about it. "If we find anything, [he said on March 2nd] it will be so old that it won't be like a man, but very ape-like, showing some human characters. . . . Then we shall know more fully what rudimentary man was like 4,000,000 (!) years ago, when the marks of his ape-like origin were many, both upon him and within him. Another page of man's evolution will be written." As a matter of fact, it seems agreed that the Pekin skull is much more modern than the so-called Trinil or Java skull: whether it is more or less ape-like is not easily decided, because the Java relic is a mere fragment of the braincap. The Bishop's utterance is of the worst type of "vulgarization," rushing in where true scientists fear to tread and allowing the wish patently to engender the thought: although why a Christian should be *anxious* to assert the simian origin of man, unless as a means of corroborat-

¹ The blind evolutionist zeal of the Anglican Bishop certainly seems to merit this reproach.

ing some personal prejudice, cannot readily be guessed. The Bishop finds a backer in a brother Anglican, Canon J. M. Wilson, who contributes to the volume "Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge" a chapter on "The Religious Effect of the Idea of Evolution." Therein he tells us: "The evolution of man from lower forms of life was in itself a new and startling fact and one which broke up the old theology." The Canon does not, nor does the Bishop, say what precise doctrines are thus "broken up," but in their "scientific" scheme there is seemingly no room for a Fall, nor, consequently, for an Atonement nor a Redemption: in other words the essence of Christianity itself disappears, and the Faith assumes the "reduced" form of a mere ethical religion. The Canon tells us, in so many words, that "the Biblical Story of the Fall" is "not historic" (p. 492) by which he means that the Fall itself is a myth. It is "a primitive attempt to account for the presence of sin and evil in the world."

These devotees of unrestricted evolution do not seem to have considered the philosophical absurdities in which their theories issue. If man has been evolved "from lower forms," whence comes the "higher" element in him which makes him human and therefore spiritual, at least in part? Are we to infer that the spiritual soul is "evolved" out of matter?—that the effect can transcend its cause? On this metaphysical rock, all materialistic theories of evolution inevitably split, and it says little for their philosophical training that men like Bishop Barnes and Canon Wilson seem unconscious of the fact. The latter deprecates God's interference with His creation, in the interest of a supposed fact of "continuity." "It is this idea and fact of continuity, impressed on us from all quarters, that is now determining what men are able to believe concerning divine action in every sphere. The evidence for continuity is overwhelming" (p. 501). Unfortunately for Canon Wilson's argument, the very opposite is the case: if there is any "law" observable it rather suggests *discontinuity*. In the *Notes* which the late T. E. Hume left on "Humanism and the Religious Attitude," he refers to the law of Discontinuity as follows: "We now absorb it unconsciously from an environment completely soaked in it; so that we regard it, not as a principle in the light of which certain regions of fact can be conceivably ordered, but as an inevitable constituent of reality itself." These, as is well known, are to-day the views of scientists generally.

It was inevitable that, with his antiquated notions, Canon Wilson would again make the familiar attempt to show the assumed facts of evolution and continuity to be a demonstration that "the essential difference of the natural and supernatural was but a passing theory in the long history of man for explaining the mysterious combination in ourselves of the spirit with the body" (p. 504). It is a pity that, after all these years, the Canon has not made a

serious endeavour to find out the true meaning of the supernatural, for, of course, "the combination in ourselves of the spirit with the body" has nothing to do with it. That combination is wholly natural, however mysterious in some of its effects. He goes on to tell us that "the facts of evolution and continuity are indications that the chain of mind reaches up to the creative Spirit of God Himself." But, as we know, continuity has been generally given up, and, although evolutionists often make that topsy-turvy assumption, evolution, rightly understood, has nothing to do with "reaching up." Evolution is a theory of "unrolling out of," and so, if there is to be any *upward* movement, it cannot be in virtue of a process of this kind. There is need of some external agency to enable the stream to rise above its source.

Without a sound theology on the Divinity of Our Lord and the Redemption, there can be no adequate theory of the supernatural. But Canon Wilson's theology is as futile as his science, being rotted with modernism. All that he has to say of Christ is merely that "He was not as other men" (p. 503). To the question—What then was He? the inadequate and unsatisfactory answer is given: "The saviour of every age is too great to be perfectly understood in any one age" (p. 504). But the difference implied is only in degree, not in essence, and we meet the wholly unwarranted assertion—"The Sonship of God, which Christ claimed for Himself before Caiphas, and for which He was declared guilty of death, He claimed for all mankind; a relationship to God which implied continuity of nature" (p. 505).

It is further claimed that the human mind "identifies in kind what we have called the supernatural with the natural." How, we may ask, can the human mind make such identification when it knows nothing direct about the supernatural? On the contrary, it can see that when Our Lord contrasts, so often and so pointedly, "eternal life" with that sustained by the bread that perishes, He means to assert an essential difference between the supernatural and the natural, which cannot, therefore, be "continuous and equally divine." This "needed continuity," we are assured, is gained "not by denying or degrading the supernatural, but by raising the natural into entire continuity with it" (p. 103). But *what* is it that thus raises the natural? As Professor Boodin of Carleton College, U.S.A., pointedly asks—"How can any process raise itself by its bootstraps?"¹ And why should there be any "raising" of the lower to the higher, when not only their continuity but even their identity in kind is "as it were regularized, as well as illustrated, by the idea of evolution." It is true that "if God has ever been anywhere He is here among us now," but it is not true that the stone, the plant, the animal, man in virtue of his creation, and man in virtue of his sonship, are all near to

¹ "Cosmic Evolution," p. 32.

Him in the same sense. Modern science admits the existence of different discontinuous levels in the created universe, and Christian faith knows that God is not only immanent in all of these but also transcends them all.

That "continuity" is just a fetish of certain narrow-minded scientists is shown by the very uncertainty of the range ascribed to evolution at the present time. Not a few philosophers and scientists, like Professors Soddy and McDougall, are unable to apply the law of evolution to the inorganic world at all,—rather a serious limitation for a theory supposed to be of universal application. Again, Sir Oliver Lodge, in illustrating evolution, uses the analogy of growth. "There is an unfolding, [he says] a development; things do not come into existence all at once. As the tree grows from the seed, as the flower unfolds from the bud, the process is gradual."¹ This Professor J. A. Thomson condemns as ignorance. "People who should know better speak of the evolution of the frog, when they mean its development; for organic evolution has to do with racial transformation and affiliation (phylogeny), not with individual development, *e.g.*, from the egg-cell to the embryo, from the larva to the adult (ontogeny)."² A chicken is not a large egg, nor is either a chicken or a hen merely a big piece of protoplasm. Even the meanest flower that blows is a synthesis, of various elements, a "whole," that implies a unity of a different order from the various materials of which it is fashioned. It is something more than growth, for which immanent powers cannot wholly account. If the finished product were due, by an impossible supposition, merely to internal forces, latent in matter and gradually forming it from inorganic protoplasm, how could it always be invariably the same, true to type? And what is true within each species, applies to their endless variety. And when these syntheses appear at higher levels of existence, the animal, the rational, it is all the more evident that the material antecedents cannot be their total cause. In the abstract, bare variety might conceivably be due to these two factors—an active organism and some change in the environment, but the *unity* of the synthesis can only be the expression of a "higher mind." Hence, modern evolutionists, steering clear of the rock which wrecks the materialist, have devised the theory of "epigenesis" or "new formation," which means, according to the late eminent psychologist, Professor James Ward, that "each new organism is not an 'educt' but a 'product.' . . . Its parts are in no sense present in the embryo, but are gradually organized one after the other in due order." This is, of course, "the direct negative of evolution as we understand it to-day." Nevertheless, we agree with Ward in exploring that, in the interests of sound philosophy as well as of

¹ "Evolution and Creation," p. 41.

² "The Gospel of Evolution," p. 154.

exact science, "widely as the term 'evolution' is used, it is rarely defined; hence, it is often without misgiving applied to processes that are diametrically opposed, to the differentiation of a unity, and to the integration of a plurality."¹

Belated Darwinians, like the Anglican dignitaries we have been considering, do not seem to keep abreast of scientific theory. Otherwise, they would not, without much qualification, assume the evolution of man from the ape: the Darwinian theory, on which the hypothesis depends, has long been rejected in favour of the modern epigenetic theory known as "Emergent Evolution," which explains the mysteries of life and of reason simply by saying they occur. Let not the retention of the term, evolution, disguise the change of theory: it is used, for the most part, as inappropriately and illogically as when Ward wrote. "Creative synthesis" is now said to be the solution to the problem. Very well, let it be so; but that is neither evolution nor a real solution. When it is admitted that creation is the effect of some transcendent Power, then the victory of common sense over materialistic theory, based on prejudice, will be nearly won.

Were not this Note already too long, one might further refer to another utterance of Dr. Barnes, wherein, speaking before members of the Wesleyan Methodist May Synod (May 14th), he said that what he is always being blamed for is his assertion that "no man can attach spiritual properties to inanimate matter." It may surprise the Bishop to know that he is here stating orthodox Catholic doctrine. Just as it is the immediate creative action of God that equips the material body with spirit, so it is the power of God, acting in this case through human agency, that changes the material substances of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. But, though he may have stumbled into accurate phraseology in this instance, we are far from accusing Dr. Barnes of anything so "unscientific" as orthodoxy.

J. ASHTON.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM: THE ORAL HYPOTHESIS.

ABBOT CHAPMAN of Downside, writing upon Père Jousse in the *Dublin Review* for July, 1929 (p. 12), has allowed himself the remark that the oral hypothesis, as a solution of the Synoptic Problem, "was originally a Protestant theory and remains essentially Protestant." It may be explained briefly that the Synoptic Problem is the problem of explaining the origin of the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) in such a way as to account adequately alike for their likenesses and their

¹ "The Realm of Ends," pp. 97, 98. 3rd edit. 1920.

differences. I have discussed the matter at some length, and have brought some more or less original considerations to bear upon it, in the Appendix to St. Matthew's Gospel in the Westminster Version; without committing myself unreservedly to the oral hypothesis, and saying that the Evangelists trusted *only* to memory, I have still endeavoured to bring out the very large part that memory must have played in the composition of the Synoptic Gospels—not necessarily the memory of the taught (as Abbot Chapman seems to understand the oral hypothesis), but the memory of the teachers. Soon after this, too soon (if I mistake not) for him to have read the Appendix, came the Father Abbot's *dictum* that the oral hypothesis is an "essentially Protestant" theory. It is one that must astonish not a little, I think, any who have studied the matter seriously, and great as is my respect for his learning, I find it impossible to take this sally quite seriously; he is not really concerned in his article to treat the matter quite seriously himself, and love of an amusing paradox has doubtless led him for once into temptation.

Unfortunately Dr. Barton, in his adaptation of Père Lagrange's *Synopsis Evangelica*, recently noticed with praise in these columns, has taken the saying *au grand sérieux*, adopting as his own a statement that he was hardly likely to make upon his own initiative (*A Catholic Harmony of the Four Gospels*, p. xvii.). I hope none will think that in taking exception to one line of the book I have anything but commendation for the work as a whole. The saying is really so indefensible that it is not worth while to waste powder and shot upon it; the earliest writers who credited Matthew with an Aramaic Gospel, Mark with the recording of Peter's Gospel and Luke with St. Paul's (to say nothing of his preface), were far from dreaming of a two-document hypothesis (condemned by the Biblical Commission, 1912), or even of a *Benützungshypothese* or "theory of successive dependence," such as that explained by Dr. Barton. No, no: if it comes to a decision by tradition, there can be no doubt that the oral, not the documentary, hypothesis will emerge victorious, and it is contrary to all truth and justice, and also to the mind of the Biblical Commission, to brand it as heretical. That is what the *dictum* here criticized really amounts to, and some will certainly understand it in that sense, though I do not mean to say that either the Father Abbot or Dr. Barton fully intend this. Far be it from me to retort in kind; I am well content to tolerate all that the Biblical Commission tolerates. But the statement I have quoted is so misleading that with the utmost respect and friendliness it does seem necessary to utter a word of protest.

C.L.

"SERMONS IN STONES."

Reflections in Winchester Cemetery.¹

THERE are no actual Memorials of the Hampshire Martyrs themselves displayed in St. James's Cemetery. But we find here tombs of some of their contemporaries who knew them and suffered imprisonment with them; tombs of the succeeding generations of Hampshire Catholics—may we not call these "the Martyrs' children"?;—tombs, also, of the men and women, priests and lay-folk who lived through the Penal Days, and slowly and painfully built up again the outward structure of the Faith in our County and were Founders of what are now flourishing parishes in the Diocese.

St. James's has always been, even when the Catholic Faith was proscribed, a Catholic cemetery. When Cardinal Beaufort, in the early fifteenth century, attached the revenues of the chapel of St. James to the Hospital of St. Cross, the former gradually fell into decay, but we learn from a manuscript once existing in the English College at Rome, a copy of which was made by Father Christopher Greene, S.J., about 1695, and is now preserved at Stonyhurst (Coll. M 196), that the use of St. James's cemetery was retained or regained by Catholics in this way. One Nicholas Tichborne, of Hartley Maudit, Hants, suffered spoliation of lands and goods for recusancy, *i.e.*, for refusing to go to the Service of Common Prayer, and was at length committed to gaol in Winchester. During nine years of imprisonment (1580—1589) he must certainly have known Bl. John Slade, the first Hampshire Martyr (1583), Bl. John Body (Andover, 1583), as also Bl. Robert Anderton and William Marsden, the priests martyred in the Isle of Wight. It is further most probable that he was well acquainted with three or four other Martyrs connected with Hampshire. His sons, Nicholas and Thomas (a priest), were martyred later on in London, but have not yet been beatified. In 1589 our confessor, still in prison, fell ill, received the Last Sacraments (not a strange fact to those who know how Winchester Prison was then managed!) and died on the feast of St. James (July 25th) towards whom he had a lifelong devotion. The Protestant Bishop of Winchester refused to allow his body, as being that of an "excommunicate," to be buried in any of the consecrated churchyards, and, though the Catholics protested that it was *they* who had consecrated these, they were powerless against his authority, and at length it occurred to them to bury the good old man in the disused churchyard of St. James. Somewhere, then, in this sacred spot, lie the unmarked

¹ Selections from an address delivered by Canon King in the St. James's Cemetery on the Feast of the English Martyrs, Sunday, May 4th, to a gathering of Hampshire Catholic pilgrims.

remains of Nicholas Tichborne, Confessor of the Faith and father of two Martyrs.

Strange though it must appear, from that date, the Catholics of Winchester have held on to this burial ground. We know that in 1800 they obtained its freehold, but for over 200 years previously they had the exclusive use of it. The early history of their use is naturally obscure, though possibly the Archives of St. Cross might throw some light upon the actual method by which they acquired some kind of legal possession. Judging by the procedure of later days, it seems safe to surmise that a lease was taken out from St. Cross by some Catholic gentleman. The earlier "trustees" may have been of the Tichborne family, for they held Winchester Castle, near at hand, from the reign of James I. till evicted by Cromwell. This guess is strengthened by the earliest tombstone in the cemetery, that, namely, of Gilbert Tichborne, who was buried here "at his own request" in 1636, at the ripe old age of "fower score and sixteene yeares." That places his birth in the year 1540, back in the days of Henry VIII., and when—as far as the laity were concerned—the Old Religion was still in possession. Gilbert was a prisoner for the Faith at least twice (in 1581 in the London Gatehouse; in 1594 in Winchester Castle). He also lost two thirds of his estate at Totford, because he "voluntarily heard Mass." His eldest brother was Benjamin, the first Baronet, and the Nicholas mentioned above was a kind of cousin.

This stone, then, commemorates a man who lived under six Sovereigns and saw the Faith destroyed, restored, and then destroyed again, and who probably died full of hope that it would later on return. But the cemetery is full of similar "sermons in stones," some of which are worth recording. There is, for instance, the headstone of Roger Corham. The Corham family were recusants in Elizabeth's reign. "Roger Corham of Hamshire" was expelled from Lincoln's Inn in 1569 "for not cominge to devine service, nor Receavinge the Communion & for using unlawfull rightes & serimonies." His tomb, undated, describes him as "a most worthy man who in most difficult times offended none and was loved by all." Mabel, wife of Roger Corham, of Hyde Barton, Winchester, is noted in the Exchequer Rolls of 1592—3 (C.R.S.) as owing £300 for recusancy. In the early part of the next century, three ladies of the family joined the English Benedictine Nuns at Ghent. Our Roger appears to have fought in the Civil Wars—on the side of the King, of course—to have suffered the usual confiscation of property meted out by the Commonwealth to "malignants," to have gone into exile with Charles II., and to have come back at the Restoration. According to Bishop Milner, he lived in the house in St. Peter Street which is now the Royal Hotel. In 1674 he purchased a plot of ground on the other side of the street and built the house he called St.

Peter's House as a home for a permanent resident priest to tend the Catholics of the city and locality. By this act, Roger Corham established for himself the title of Founder of the first Catholic Public Mission in Hampshire, as distinguished from Chaplaincies to Catholic gentry. In Peterhouse, Mass was said, when circumstances would allow, until a small chapel was erected in 1740, in the garden at the back, which chapel was replaced by Milner's church in 1792.

The tombstone of Frances Smith illustrates the next chapter in the history of St. James. Roger Corham sold his first house (now the Royal Hotel) to Bartholomew Smith whose family succeeded Corham as the patrons or godfathers to the Catholic Body in Winchester. Frances was the widow of Bartholomew's son, whose brother James became the first Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District (1688—1711). From this fact their house became known locally as "Bishop's House."

A mausoleum in the centre of the ground commemorates the family of William Sheldon, who married Anastasia, daughter of Frances Smith, and died in 1745. He and his descendants for two generations acted as trustees of the Catholic church property in Winchester. An Act of Parliament of 1799, dealing with Land Tax, made it possible for St. Cross to sell St. James's to the Catholics, and accordingly the legal transfer took place for the modest sum of £42.

Another benefactor of the mission, William Meader, a prosperous merchant of Winchester and the right-hand man of Dr. Milner, rests in the graveyard. He supervised the building of old St. Peter's and contributed largely towards its cost. He also helped towards the purchase of the Cemetery, and at his death, left valuable property in Jewry Street to the Parish. He died on the very day his great friend was consecrated Bishop of the Midland District in the Old church, May 23, 1803.

The tomb of Mrs. Mary Farguharson recalls the strictness with which even then the laws of the Church were enforced. Her husband was a Protestant, but besides erecting an elaborate monument to his wife, he built the caretaker's lodge and the wall around the whole site, largely at his own expense. To his deep regret he could not obtain permission to be buried in the place where none but Catholics have ever been laid to rest, appealing, in vain, to all the Vicars Apostolic to overcome the objections of Father Delaney, priest of Winchester; so he secured the nearest site to the cemetery in the Lane hard by, so as to be as close as possible to "his adorable angel."

Besides these memorials to persons closely connected with the Winchester mission, there are numerous others of more general interest to be found in St. James's. The name of Lady Elizabeth Arundell, a daughter of William Brooke, Esq., of Longwood, re-

calls a centre of Catholic activity in Penal Days. In 1583 a spy reported that several priests frequented the place. Two Benedictine Fathers died there during the Civil Wars. Just lately this manor has come again into Catholic hands. Elizabeth married an Arundell of Lanherne, and upon his death returned to the family home. She is mentioned under Owslebury as a "convicted recusant" in the days of Charles II. Her stone here is undated.

One of her chaplains was William Rudge, O.D.C., here described as "John Rigler, Discased (*sic*) Carmelit," buried in 1664. The people of Winchester apparently were tolerant enough not to mind being told that a Popish priest, and a Regular to boot, *had* lived in their midst.

Another religious grave is that of the Ven. Paul Atkinson, O.S.F., who, we learn from its inscription, spent 30 years of his life a prisoner in Hurst Castle for the crime of his priesthood, and was buried here in October, 1729. Father Paul was one of the last of our Confessors to die in prison, and we trust that his "witness" may be recognized one day by his beatification.

Bernard Howard, a direct ancestor of the present Duke of Norfolk, was buried in this cemetery in 1735, and his stone records that he was more illustrious by his Christian life than by the blood of his distinguished ancestors. The elder line of the Dukes died out in the early nineteenth century and thus the many titles of this great House passed to the children of this Bernard.

After the Carmelite and Franciscan, we have records too of a Jesuit, one, Sir Peter Curzon, Bart., S.J., who was chaplain to the Wells family at Brambridge. Of this family in the sixteenth century Bl. Swithun Wells was martyred in London for permitting Mass to be said in his house; whilst his brother Gilbert suffered fines and imprisonment for the Faith. The family remained staunch Catholics till they died out with Father Gilbert Wells, S.J., in 1777. Brambridge had meanwhile passed to another Catholic family, the Smythes of Acton Burnel, one of whom, Maria, was the Mrs. Fitzherbert who married George IV. Books once belonging to the families of Wells and Smythe, as well as to some of their chaplains, are now in the Winchester Parochial Library.

On the tombstone of Mrs. Milner, mother of the great Bishop, who left Winchester in 1803 for the Midlands where he died in 1826, may be found the expression, "Pray for the soul," then usually judged unwise to use.

A name otherwise noteworthy is that of John Lingard, who was the carpenter who did all the woodwork in Milner's church: his "Wages" sheet is still preserved. Of wider fame is, of course, his gifted son, Dr. Lingard, the first truthful historian after the Reformation. Catholic Wintonians are proud to be able to number him as one of their own.

Many more interesting inscriptions might be quoted, illustrative of Catholic history, for here, in this sacred spot, we have an epitome of the Penal Days. The persecutor, alas! saw to it that none of our Martyrs should be buried here, but of confessors there are plenty. Many of the tombs speak to us of fines, imprisonment and of the hundred minor forms of vexation, cheerfully endured by their occupants rather than abandon the Old Religion of England.

May we, one and all, learn from them a deeper appreciation of the same Faith which it is our privilege to possess.

JOHN H. KING.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The States Ratify the London Treaty.

The ratification of the London Naval Treaty by the American Senate took place on Monday, July 21st, after a long and very sterile debate. Whatever its merits, the Constitution of the United States affords almost unlimited opportunities for delaying legislation, and several senators, with little seeming sense of responsibility, exploited these to the full. The expert advice which the Foreign Committee got from the U.S. Navy was much the same as that uttered in the House of Lords—"In a world full of potential enemies the Fleet is wholly inadequate; therefore, put not your trust in treaties and leagues and pacts, but in 'reeking tube and iron shard,' and many floating fortresses to carry them." The expert deals in force, and he debates all questions in terms of force, nor can Othello be expected to assist with any gusto at the disappearance of his occupation. The fighting-man will be the last to realize that national security is created more readily, more permanently and, above all, more cheaply by universal disarmament than by armament. A totally disarmed world, effectively policed, would be perfectly at peace. It is because your neighbour openly "carries guns" that you are moved to carry them too. To this effect spoke Lord Cecil of Chelwood to the 430 members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, representing 31 British and foreign parliaments, which held its twenty-sixth Conference in London in the second half of July. Disarmament, he said, was something positive. Means of aggression, once laid aside, or greatly reduced, ceased to be a menace. Agreements not to use existing armed forces but to resort to arbitration, might be swept away by gusts of popular passion, from which no nation, even the most civilized, was exempt. In civil communities the unauthorized carrying of lethal weapons was forbidden, just because of the constant temptation to use them; thus the ungoverned passions of individuals rarely disturb the public peace. A sound argu-

ment. We look forward to the day when the public mind shall have so realized the common sense of this matter that the question of disarmament will no longer be left in the hands of politicians and "experts," but its rational solution insisted on by popular demand, even by popular clamour. Public opinion needs educating, and of its educators—the Church, the School, the Press, the Politician—only the first shows any method and consistency in her teaching. The various peoples, even the Russian, are peaceful. The American people are peaceful but inert; the French people are peaceful but impotent; the Italians are peaceful but misguided; the English are peaceful but dumb. It needs a new Peter the Hermit to preach a Crusade for peace to a world still strangely unconvinced of the folly and futility and general sinfulness of war.

**The
Federation of
Europe.**

M. Briand's attempt to divert the minds of the nations of Europe from their particular to their common interests, has had a general welcome from the nations addressed; a little too general to be of any immediate practical use. But it is all to the good that the matter should have been mooted, and the discussion of it in the November Assembly will be the more fruitful in consequence of the various reactions already produced. It is reassuring to know that many countries—Great Britain and Germany especially—were strongly averse to anything that would in any way impair the strength and efficacy of the League of Nations. Italy shrewdly pointed out, and other nations as well, that a tariff agreement leaving out Russia and Turkey would not be European. Germany naturally and not obscurely suggests a revision of Versailles: "a bold reform of conditions recognized as untenable should be faced in the spirit of understanding, and thus a real pacification of Europe achieved, such as can rest only upon the foundations of justice and equality." France and the Little Entente are strenuously opposed to any revision of frontiers, and one can readily see that a general calling in question of national boundaries would greatly endanger the cause of peace. But injustice, rankling and unremedied, also disturbs peace and, considering that Article 19 of the Covenant itself makes provision for the reconsideration of "treaties which have become inapplicable," it cannot be fairly said that every detail of the Versailles Treaty must be deemed for ever sacrosanct. Italy's sensible proposal that a radical reduction of armaments should precede economic federation meets, alas! with no favour with French politicians, who, almost alone in Europe, pin their faith to security based on predominant force. Speaking to the Inter-Parliamentary delegates on July 22nd, the British Premier declared once more that "peace is the greatest cause in front of the world now. No nation can afford to contemplate war and prepare for it." Unhappily, several nations, in the grip of the old deadly fallacy, continue to seek peace by preparing for war, though they assuredly cannot afford it.

**Economic
Causes of War.**

In the same address, Mr. MacDonald put his finger on one main cause of war, the covetousness that exploits human labour for profit. He did not hesitate to call those Parliamentarians, who tolerate in their respective countries inhuman conditions of labour and living, "common enemies." The abandonment by industry of the old Catholic conception of the "just price," which followed the break-up of Christendom in the sixteenth century, has found its nemesis in the prevalence of modern usury, and incidentally in the tariff-wars, whereby the nations strive after material prosperity at each other's expense. It is very often because the standard of living and of wages in one nation is unduly low that it can undersell another, and thus provoke that other to tax its imports. The phenomenon of "Chinese cheap labour" constantly reappears, wherever labour is underpaid, and "sweated" goods are put upon the market. The trouble is that the standard of humane living is not invariable. Climate has much to say to it, for human needs—food, clothing and shelter—change with latitude. The living wage for cotton operatives in India, for instance, must needs be lower in absolute value than that paid in Lancashire. Unless this natural inequality is in some way counteracted, the standard will always tend to the lower level, and on that account the International Labour Office is constantly trying to equalize labour conditions everywhere :

Social legislation is becoming more and more an international effort [said Mr. MacDonald] and it is your duty, irrespective of the political sections to which you belong, to go with us and the other leaders of Parliaments, to agree to common standards which enforce on the economic controlling powers, common conceptions of human justice, mercy and righteousness.

Advocates of tariff restrictions aim at the same result by a different process, and if this were their only aim—to maintain a decent standard of living amongst the workers—and if it had only that result, they would be so far justified. But, having always in view the conditions of industrial peace, it may be worth while to call attention to the recent Hawley tariff-bill in U.S.A., which was signed by the President on June 17th. It seems to be as a whole singularly unpopular, at home as well as abroad. How then did it pass? The New York correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* thus explains :

The measure as a whole has hardly any single friend anywhere, and was passed as the result of an orgy of "logrolling," each senator or representative getting protection for the products of his own State and in return voting for similar protection for industries represented by his colleagues.

Many important newspapers in all parts of the country fought bitterly against the adoption of the bill on the grounds

that it will add at least £200,000,000 annually to the cost of living and will not aid the farmers, as it is supposed to do, will not restore the industries, like textiles, which are declining although heavily protected, but will interfere with foreign trade and bring reprisals from European countries. More than one thousand professional economists and scores of leading industrialists have protested against the bill.

The bill finally passed only through the aid of several Democrats, some of whom obtained special favours for the products of their regions, while others deliberately voted for what they believed to be a bad measure in the hope that the country will rebel and turn the Republicans out of office at the next national election in 1932.

It is this almost inevitable confusion of economics with politics, so marked a feature of American public life, the intrigues of finance, the lobbying of "vested interests" that result from a State adopting Protection, that seems to some to make the policy inadvisable. Money, as it is, has too much influence in political affairs; to allow State action to be dictated by various economic interests would be to open the door to every sort of sordid intrigue.

"Pressocracy."

Provided justice is not infringed there is no question of principle involved in a commercial device such as Protection. Accordingly, we are not interested here in the quarrels of the Conservative Party which centre round various tariff proposals, but every citizen should be concerned with some of the methods by which that dispute is being conducted, for they involve his rights and standing as a member of a democracy. As such, he has a representative in the national Parliament, put there, it may be, by the help of his vote, and that representative has a share in making, or perhaps administering, the law. Now, there has appeared another power outside the Constitution, commonly but inaccurately styled "the Fourth Estate," which pretends to take a predominant part in government. It aims at much more than that healthy and honest criticism, which it is the function of the Press in a democracy to administer to the legislature. It claims to dictate policy and to veto the appointment of ministers,—to supersede, in fact, both the Government and the Crown. Such ambition has become possible in these later days because of the Press monopoly secured by a few millionaires, and because enormous circulations have been created for their papers by the artificial process of free insurance of purchasers. It has long been foreshadowed by the formation of larger and larger newspaper trusts: the small public reaction to the monstrous attempt is a sign of the long way we have progressed towards the Servile State. Mr. Belloc and others foresaw and foretold long ago what has now come to pass, and indeed, one of the Press Lords, Lord Beaverbrook, in his booklet "Politi-

cians and the Press," published a few years ago, clearly had in view the present situation. The other, Lord Rothermere, in his famous letter to Mr. P. J. Hannon, put forward his claims, as newspaper proprietor, to dictate policy and approve ministers, in so many words. There are few independent papers left to make protest against this perversion of legitimate journalism, but Mr. Wickham Steed in the current *Review of Reviews* denounces what he calls "Pressocracy" with a somewhat belated force and insight, whilst the politician most concerned, Mr. Baldwin, on June 24th, stigmatized it justly as a "preposterous and insolent demand." What can be done to prevent this attempt to subvert the Constitution? Mr. Steed suggests that it may be necessary "to restrict the newspaper industry by law to its proper functions," and advocates a Government enquiry into the methods of the "Pressocracy." But it would need a dictator to reform the Press against its will.

**The Irish
Censorship.**

The feeble endeavour which is being made in Ireland to prevent the circulation of newspapers which purvey indecency is an illustration of the difficulty of making a start. The banning of a paper means immediate financial loss to the shareholders and the newsvendors, and the authorities are naturally loth to inflict this penalty. But the Irish Censorship Act seems, according to report, to be administered with lamentable weakness. Catholics everywhere are concerned with this attempt to uphold Christian ideals of morality, where it has every chance of success, because public opinion in a Catholic country must needs be favourable to it. The Commission, out of which the Act took shape, furnished evidence that would have justified something far more drastic, so that if even an inadequate measure is laxly administered, the Minister of Justice must be held blameworthy. He remitted the ban on two notorious papers on promise that "in future an *unduly* large proportion of space" would not be devoted to records of crime. According to *The Catholic Mind* of July, the first *clean* issue of one paper contained nearly fifty crime stories, whilst the other, in addition to other objectionable features, had three birth-control advertisements! We hope that the Irish Catholic press will continue to remind the Minister of his duty, and that that other means of instructing and guiding public opinion, the pulpit, will not be silent. But so long as Irish Catholics are content that their chief national paper should be one that is alien to Catholic faith and morality, public opinion would seem to need some enlightening.

**"The Priest
in Politics."**

"The pretensions of the Papacy to ordain how a British colony shall be administered are utterly inadmissible." This characteristic utterance of Mr. Wickham Steed, never more oracular or less trustworthy than when dealing with Catholic affairs abroad, is

simply one variety of the fantasia, played by the whole British secular press on the false but familiar theme—"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England" (Art. 37)—apropos of the politico-religious trouble in Malta. We cannot be surprised at this attitude, which is, indeed, inevitable in all those who look upon the Catholic Church, centred in Rome, as a man-made institution and deny her claim to rule over the whole flock of Christ. If that view is correct, then, of course, Rome has no right to interfere with the spiritual freedom either of the individual or of the community. Her claims are pretensions. Until Mr. Steed and the rest become Catholics they will continue to think so, and we may congratulate ourselves that the *Times* is now merely ill-mannered and not truculent, as in the days of "Papal Aggression." But the unbelief of the unbeliever cannot alter facts. The Holy See has never ceased to have spiritual jurisdiction over all the world, however the gentiles rage and the peoples form silly plans. In the exercise of that jurisdiction she may forbid what the civil power commands—to offer incense, for instance, to Cæsar—or point out other things that are sinful and prohibited, thus defining the moral law. So the Catholic Bishops in Venezuela, a Catholic republic, have recently denounced Masonic legislation, which aims at introducing into that Catholic community the poisonous practices of easy divorce and civil marriage, destructive of the basis of society, and the equal abomination of lay education, an attack on parental rights. Thus the Holy See banned the *Action Française*, both periodical and association, because that political body was misleading Catholics by false doctrine concerning the State. Politics can rarely be thoroughly divorced from ethics: even the by-laws of a railway company may sometimes have a moral bearing. Consequently, whether the world likes it or no, the eyes of the Church are upon all its works, her mind assesses their moral value and her voice, on occasion, declares it for the guidance of her flock. Those who do not believe that, speaking generally, she, like her Founder, "has the words of eternal life," may naturally resent her criticism, although it is not primarily addressed to them. All that we can ask of them is, first that they should recognize the *de facto* supra-national character of the Catholic Church, and that, secondly, her authorities, granted their commission, are acting within it when they give moral directions to the faithful. These principles are clear; they are part of the normal Catholic doctrine on the relations between Church and State; they may be wrongly or inadequately applied, and even Catholics have warrant to question the correctness of their application. But no Catholic can rightly deny them.¹

¹ In Abbot Butler's great work on the Vatican Council may be found a concise statement of the Catholic teaching on Church and State which the Council had not time formally to discuss. The C.T.S. pamphlet, "The Things that are Cæsar's," may also be consulted, as a useful assertion of principle.

**India
Impatient.**

At the close of Lord Curzon's first viceroyalty in India, he said: "I have not offered political concessions to the educated classes, because I do not regard it as wisdom or statesmanship in the interests of India to do so." On the contrary, he strengthened as much as he could the traditional British autocracy. Curzon spoke in 1904; since then, by a process of development greatly hastened by the world-upheaval, the old autocracy has disappeared, and the present difficulty is to slow down and regulate the movement for radical change. This craving for immediate results, this contempt for the "inevitability of gradualness"—to use the immortal Webbian phrase—is defeating its own purpose. India in the last half century has advanced with incredible rapidity. Since Mr. Montague's declaration in Parliament in July, 1917,—“The policy of H.M. Government is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire”—there has been no marked deviation from that policy, which, in fact, in 1919, was embodied in the present Constitution. Since that date India has had provincial legislatures of her own and a large amount of self-government. The Act was admittedly an experimental instalment and was, therefore, made subject to revision at the end of ten years. In view of the impending revision the Simon Commission, which has lately issued its monumental Report, was set up two and a half years ago. No one can study the first part of that Report—the “status quaestionis”—without realizing the terrible complexity of the problem and the impossibility of any simple or sudden solution. A country nearly half the size of Europe with three-quarters of its population, even more varied in race, religion and language than the European community—the welding of such a mass into a single political entity, fitted to be “freely associated [with the other Dominions] as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations,” must necessarily be a very protracted operation.

**Freedom
its Ultimate
Goal.**

All the more reason for not causing unnecessary delays. There are still people who maintain the old idea of the British Raj—a conscientious and benevolent despotism ruling millions of undeveloped races for their own good, and its own profit. And their loudly-expressed opinions are taken by the Indian leaders to prove the Government's insincerity and the persistence of the white man's contempt for the coloured. These people hold that to suggest that “Dominion status” is a feasible aim for India was a mistake, yet even in 1844 Henry Lawrence wrote—

We cannot hold India for ever. Let us so conduct ourselves in our civil and military relations as, when the connection

ceases, it may do so, not with convulsions, but with mutual esteem and affection; and that England may have in India a noble ally, enlightened, and brought into the scale of nations under her guidance and fostering care.

The war has taught us this, that the only justification for the tutelage of one nation by another is the training of the former to govern itself. Our concern in all this is, of course, the conversion of those teeming millions of pagans, which is delayed and obstructed by civil disturbances and want of harmony between West and East. We trust that in the Round Table Conference which meets in the autumn, account will be taken of the policy of the Holy See in advocating the increase of an indigenous clergy in India and throughout the foreign missions. There is no stronger evidence of belief in racial equality and worth than the elevation of "natives" to the high dignity of the priesthood.

A
Secularist
Encyclopædia.

We have remarked upon the folly of expecting from unbelievers the same views of the public action of the Church as the faithful naturally take. It is equally absurd to look for sympathy and understanding from the world in the whole series of its contacts with the Church throughout history. The non-Catholic is incapable of doing justice to the Catholic, just because he has a different set of principles and convictions. Any works of secular learning, therefore, like the various encyclopædias, must needs bristle with inaccuracies and falsehoods about the character, teaching, history and spirit of the Church of Christ, since they lack the first element of understanding, the knowledge that she is the Church of Christ. There is no need generally to impute bad faith in the compilers of such books; there is, however, a lack of historical scholarship and no lack of deep-seated prejudice in even the most learned. One may instance the latest edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," which, the more it is examined, affords the more evidence of a modernistic, materialistic, anti-Catholic, and even anti-Christian bias that makes it wholly untrustworthy in all matters concerning religion. We except, of course, the few articles written by Catholics; too few to alter the prevailing irreligious nature of the whole. Generally speaking, the Catholic view on controversial topics is not even mentioned, and few chances are missed of sneering at the Church and her doctrines. The use of such contemptuous terms as Monkery, Papist, Popish, Romanist—shocking lapses of taste in a book intended for common use—is not infrequent. In an age when reputable historians have largely emancipated themselves from the old *clichés* of Protestantism and discarded the language of vulgar polemics, it is disconcerting to find them here as strongly entrenched as ever. Catholic truth is constantly affronted, directly and by innuendo, in the articles (to men-

tion only some), on the Bible, Christianity, Jesus Christ, the Mother of Jesus, Mass, Mystery, Pentecost, Prayer, Reformation, Sacraments, Theology. Here is a typical extract from "Christianity" (vol. 5, p. 637, col. 2)—"The view that Jesus deliberately founded a Church (an ecclesiastical institution), appointed the Apostles its rulers, settled its rites, gave it its doctrine and guaranteed its fidelity, can only be maintained by discarding history altogether." We cannot, we repeat, complain if the world writes according to its ignorance and malice; but we need not pay the world which does so for so doing. If Catholics are ignored, let them ignore in turn. And let them be grateful for the "Catholic Encyclopædia" and the kindred works that are springing up to supplement it, which effectively combine secular learning with religious truth.

**B.B.C.
not Religiously
Neutral.**

The handicap which we Catholics suffer from living as a small minority in a non-Catholic atmosphere is not confined to the written word. Inherited prejudice is apt to break out, as it were unconsciously, whenever a non-Catholic opens his mouth on any topic that touches on religion. Things are much better than they were, and we hope will become better still. But there are certain institutions such as the cinema and the B.B.C., which, catering for the general public, are in duty bound to be religiously, as well as politically, neutral. The former rarely stages anything formally anti-Catholic though it frequently sins against Christian morality. The latter, unfortunately, has not been so careful. For instance, it has permitted a certain Professor of Philosophy at London University to ventilate, in twelve broadcast lectures on "The Philosophy of Freedom," the crudest antinomianism, attacking in the name of personal liberty the very foundations of law and morality. In a vigorous "Open Letter" to the Prime Minister (*Catholic Times*, 25.7.30), Father McNabb, O.P., calls attention to this corruption of the public mind, carried on through an agency under Government licence. Again, the Editor of the *Glasgow Observer*, (26.7.30), rightly takes the B.B.C. to task for broadcasting an inaccurate and misleading account of the Malta dispute, based upon the *ex parte* Government statement alone. It is as if the Post Office, on its own account, took to disseminating anti-Catholic literature. If in the circumstances we cannot hope for all-round justice from the non-Catholic community in which we live, it is still our duty to meet unfairness by protest.

**Dr. Barnes
and
Anglicanism.**

We have commented adversely, as have other Catholic papers, on the repeated offensive utterances of the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham regarding the most sacred mysteries of our Faith, and no doubt we shall have occasion to do so again,

for the Bishop seems to be as voluble as he is unteachable. At present, he is in the curious position of refusing an order of the High Court of Chancery to institute a certain "Anglo-Catholic" vicar to a benefice in his diocese, because that clergyman will not promise not to reserve the Sacrament,—the order in question having been procured by the trustees of the living, amongst whom is the "Anglo-Catholic" Bishop of Truro! Well might Dr. Barnes express his pained surprise that "a responsible body of Anglo-Catholic patronage trustees, including a Diocesan Bishop, would abandon the old High Church doctrine of the spiritual independence of the Church, and appeal to the lay Courts" (Statement to the Press: *Times*, 14.4.30). Yet his own duty, as he frequently says, is "to administer the law of the land." Not apparently to obey it! The Bishop's object is to put down false sacramental teaching amongst his clergy, some of whom believe in the Real Presence. To teach that ministers without valid orders can consecrate the Holy Eucharist is of course erroneous, and the Bishop is to that extent right, but his own form of error is that even valid orders cannot convey that power. God Himself, apparently, cannot make "a spiritual presence be attached to or inhere in, inert matter," or, at any rate, he cannot delegate the power. More than any living rationalist, this Anglican Bishop has weakened belief in the supernatural amongst his generation, yet he prides himself on his zeal for "sound Anglican teaching." His "gorilla" sermon in Westminster Abbey, on June 14, 1925, wherein he declared that "Darwin's triumph had destroyed the whole theological scheme," has not closed that "comprehensive" pulpit to his attacks on Christianity. On June 9th last year and on June 1st this, from the Abbey pulpit, he was allowed to denounce "the Church" for being slow to accept man's purely animal ancestry, and for hesitating to recommend the vile practice of artificial contraception. The failure of his own Church to denounce him is one proof among many that she is not the Church of Christ. We are aware that many individuals have condemned the Bishop; even in St. Paul's, he was arraigned as a heretic by a neighbouring rector. But these recurring invitations to occupy the chief pulpit in Anglicanism shows how little those in authority care what heresy he preaches.

**The
Lambeth
Conference.**

The Conference of Anglican Bishops at present sitting at Lambeth, is the seventh of a series, which began in 1867 and has continued at intervals of, roughly, ten years; always growing in importance with its growth in size, and growing in size with the growth and development of the English-speaking peoples. But no multiplication of "daughter" Churches and Missions can make

Anglicanism Catholic. Even were the British Commonwealth, which now embraces territorially a quarter of the globe, to absorb the rest, and plant branches of the Establishment everywhere, the Church of the English-speaking, founded in 1559, would not lose its racial character and its limited appeal. It poses as a part of the Church Catholic, but at best its Conference represents a loose federation of organizations, attached sentimentally to the "mother Church" of Canterbury, but otherwise independent, and developing in faith and practice in different directions and at different rates. Its leaders talk of unity, but give no satisfactory definition of that general term; they speak of union but fail to specify what it implies and how only it can be reached. They do not even agree that Christ founded a Church, or, assuming that He did, what sort of a Church it was meant to be. We, on the contrary, hold that Our Lord did found a permanent Church and only one, that He meant it to teach His revelation infallibly, rule with His authority, and mediate grace through His Sacraments. As the great decisive Encyclical, *Mortalium Animos*, which we are glad to see included in Bishop Bell's second collection of "Documents on Christian Unity,"—and may it be in the hands of all the worthy men assembled at Lambeth!—points out, unity must be founded on Faith; the acceptance, *i.e.*, of God's entire revelation on the authority of God Himself, speaking through His living Church. Union of hearts in charity, though it should exist, is not enough; revealed truth is primarily addressed to the mind, addressed in human language and, therefore, since that is such an inadequate vehicle, must be accompanied by an authentic interpretation.

**The
Bishops'
Dilemma.**

There is no such help to the hands of the Prelates at Lambeth. They form a highly-dignified debating society, but they have no means of deciding the questions they discuss. They cannot proclaim to their flocks—"Thus saith the Lord." Yet one of the main questions before them—the proposed union of Anglicans and Nonconformists in the South Indian mission—raises the whole doctrine of Apostolical Succession, and on its determination, one way or the other, depends the future status of Anglicanism in the eyes of its adherents. *The Church Times* (24.1.30, p. 87), contrasting the Catholic with the Nonconformist theory, admits that "the Church has tolerated both views of Episcopacy," yet on the same page it blames Lord Hugh Cecil for saying—"Episcopacy is an open question." Bishop Gore, on the other hand, not obscurely hints secession if the scheme goes through—"some [features remain] which may be found so inconsistent with [Anglo-Catholic] principles that they could not remain in communion with any Church that formally sanctioned them." The dilemma before the Lambeth Bishops, therefore, is—whether to declare Episcopacy non-essential, and so give up all hopes of union with the Orthodox,

or to turn down the South-India scheme, and thus alienate the Protestants. But Anglicanism has faced and survived similar fundamental dilemmas in the past. As a *Church Times* leader (20.6.30) says, with somewhat cynical frankness, "It will be a singular departure from Anglican precedent, if the united diplomatic, prudent and cautious elements in the forthcoming Conference are unable to produce a formula sufficiently ambiguous to avert the danger of calamitous schism or secession." Let Dr. Gore take heart.

**Education
Bill
Withdrawn.**

The Catholic North has added another to the three or four scalps of unjust Education Bills dangling at its belt; for there can be little doubt that the united protest of seven Northern dioceses in Liverpool on Sunday, June 22nd, was the *coup de grâce*

to the Measure, which was actually withdrawn on the following Friday. More than 150,000 Catholics of the Province joined with their Archbishop in endorsing in the strongest terms the Cardinal's declaration that the Bill was "quite unacceptable to Catholics." The Liverpool rejection of the Bill was to have been followed, if necessary, by others in Manchester and in London: there was, as a matter of fact, another demonstration at Blenheim on July 14th, when Dr. Downey took occasion to reiterate the Catholic desire to co-operate with the Government in every improvement in popular education, which did not violate justice. Another eirenic utterance was published by Bishop Browne in the Catholic papers of July 18th, pointing out an obstacle to the granting of the demands of voluntary schools, which is often overlooked, viz., the existence of some 4,800 areas where the only school is Anglican or Catholic, which accordingly, many children of other faiths are forced to attend. Now, the Dissenter who sees no harm in Catholics being rated in support of the non-religious Council school, is much wounded in conscience by having to support voluntary schools; moreover, the undenominational teacher takes it very ill that he or she is debarred from service in so large a number of State-supported schools. These objections, which have a surface plausibility in them, go far to explain why the adversary is unimpressed by the Catholic plea for justice. The Bishop, therefore, suggests that here there is room for a degree of compromise, allowing, we take it, the strictly Catholic character of some 30 Catholic schools in "single-school areas"—for with those only we are concerned—to be impaired, in order to secure full justice for the remaining 1,110. Critics have considered this concession a weakening of the Catholic demand, a dangerous insertion of the thin end of the wedge. At any rate it is a helpful endeavour to understand the enemy's point of view.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Blood, The Precious: Theology of [E. Kaiser, C.P.P.S., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, July 1930, p. 1].

Church, The, a Bulwark of Morality [Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, quoted in *Tablet*, July 25, 1930, p. 109].

Modernism: effects on ecclesiastical Studies [Bruno de Solages in *Revue Apologétique*, July 1930, p. 5].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Divorce, Mr. Justice Hill and [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Catholic Times*, July 11, 1930, p. 11].

Malta: documents concerning [*Tablet*, June 28, 1930, p. 859].

Malta, British Government unfair to [H. Somerville in *Christian Democrat*, July 1930, p. 100: "Liverpool Post's" fiasco regarding "White Book," *Tablet*, July 7, 1930, p. 5: articles throughout the month in all Catholic weeklies].

Maltese Question, The [Articles by Mgr. Dandria in *Catholic Times*, July 4-25, 1930].

Orthodox, Schism amongst the [G. Bennigsen in *Tablet*, July 19, 1930, p. 75: Obstacles to Reunion with, Dom B. Winslow, O.S.B., in *Pax*, July-August, 1930].

Protestants, Two Lost [G.K.C. on James Douglas and Middleton Murry in *America*, May 17, 1930, p. 131].

Protestant Proselytizing, Danger of [G. Bliss, S.J., in *Messenger of S.H.*, August 1930, p. 225].

Religion, Testimony of American Statesmen to need of [P. L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, June 14, 1930, p. 233].

Turmel, the Abbé: further proofs of his heterodoxy [J. Rivière in *Revue Apologétique*, July 1930, p. 31].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Augustine, St., and Catholic Action [Rev. J. Daniel in *St. Peter's Magazine*, June 1930, p. 85: the Philosophy of, L. Walker, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, July 1930, p. 104].

Calendar-Reform, The Question of [P. A. McNally, S.J., in *Homiletic Review*, July 1930, p. 1033].

Education, The Pope on: how to use the Encyclical [P. L. Blakely, S.J., *America*, June 28, 1930, p. 281: Equality the Solution of the Schools Trouble, Rev. M. O'Ryan, O.M.I., in *Universe*, July 25, 1930, p. 1].

Gill as Artist, Mr. Eric: Failings of [G. Bennigsen in *Blackfriars*, July 1930, p. 404].

India, An American Catholic View of British Government in [Fr. Gillis, C.P., in *Catholic World*, July 1930, p. 482: View of French Catholics, *Etudes*, July 15, 1930].

Japan, Hopes for Catholicism in [F. N. Roggen, S.J., in *Messenger of S.H.*, July 1930, p. 216].

Leakage due to defective religious training [Rev. J. Hogan in *Catholic Times*, June 27, 1930, p. 11].

REVIEWS

I—REVELATION¹

FR. DIECKMANN, S.J., whose death in 1928 at the age of 48 meant the loss to Catholic scientific theology of one whose merits in the field he had made his own were universally acknowledged, has left in his volumes "De Ecclesia," and "De Revelatione" a *monumentum* which would do honour to anyone who had given twice the time to the same work. We know of no similar volumes which can compare with his for width of learning, clearness of thought, strictness of method, and thoroughness of exposition. The "De Revelatione," which contains the lectures given by Fr. Dieckmann at the Jesuit Theologate of Valkenburg, follows the two volumes "De Ecclesia" in purpose, character, and external appearance. The paper, unfortunately, is not as good as that used in the former volumes, and the difference which this has made in the general appearance and "feel" of the book is noticeable.

After an Introduction (pp. 1—81) dealing with general questions concerning Fundamental Theology, the author treats of Revelation (pp. 83—328), and of Jesus Christ, the Divine Legate (pp. 329—675). A Scriptural index, and a general index (pp. 677—694) complete the volume.

We have already expressed our opinion about the work as a whole. Space suffices only for a brief reference to some of the many points in it which call for notice. In the first part a chapter (pp. 83—130) is devoted to Religion, which he discusses in its historical, metaphysical, and psychological aspects, defining the nature of the acts in which religion consists, its necessity, and the obligation of seeking after the positive religion revealed by God. His well-grounded reasons for admitting this question into the volume are succinctly stated in pp. 83, 84.

In his treatment of the nature of revelation we find the author's breadth of view and soundness of judgment best displayed. He takes the notion of revelation as found *de facto* in the New Testament and the Council of the Vatican, and makes a close examination of its meaning. He considers the definitions proposed by other theologians, explaining their variations, as largely due to differences in points of view and method. Finally, he briefly dismisses certain false notions widely prevalent to-day.

We agree with the adverse judgment passed by Fr. Dieckmann on the validity of the method of Immanence—a question much to

¹ *De Revelatione Christiana*. By Herman Dieckmann, S.J. Friburg: Herder. Pp. xxii. 694. Price M. 20.

the fore in recent years. On another point, also in dispute, he presents arguments for his position which we do not remember to have seen developed elsewhere. Should the Divinity of Christ be proved in a treatise of Fundamental Theology? The reasons usually adduced *pro* and *contra* are familiar, but the author further shows that, historically, the claim to Divinity is on the same footing as the claim to Messiahship; indeed, the evidence for the former is in itself even clearer and more abundant than for the latter. Of the words of Christ Himself there are scarcely any which claim Messiahship without claiming Divinity as well. Accordingly, proofs of Christ's Divinity may reasonably find a place in this treatise.

In conclusion, the following items may be taken as illustration of the large spirit which marks all Fr. Dieckmann's work. He includes a discussion of the question whether the possibility of mystery is capable of being positively proved, and of the question (which is not one of words) whether revelation is preternatural or supernatural. He points the necessary texts in the hotly-debated question of the Slavonic Josephus—and shows up the extravagances of Dr. Eisler.¹ On the idea of Christ the King, he sketches the teaching both of Pius XI. in the Encyclical "Quas Primas" (1925): and—much to our delight—of Jacobus de Viterbo in his "De regimine christiano," written in 1302, and recently published by M. Arquillière (1926).

Fr. Dieckmann is beyond the reach of our praise or blame: but we congratulate those students who had the privilege of such a master, and recommend his book unreservedly to students and professors of theology alike.

R.H.

2—ESSAYS IN CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.²

PROFESSOR HODGSON presents in this volume his thoughts on various philosophical and ethical topics, *e.g.*, Psychology, and Religious Belief, Sin, Freedom, Birth Control, Authority. He writes in a pleasing and persuasive style. His views are often sound and expressed with remarkable moderation. We are all the more inclined to welcome his work, as it is not likely to find much acceptance among those who will judge him to be outside the pale on the ground of his outspoken confession (p. 171)—"Meanwhile I continue to believe that the pursuit of philosophy will be helped and not hindered by combining with the habit of

¹ In the same sense, cf. *Revue Biblique*, Jan. 1930, where Fr. Lagrange, O.P., deals with Reinach and Eisler; also cf. Thackeray, "Josephus the Man and the Historian" (1929), who is reserved but sceptical.

² By Leonard Hodgson, M.A., Hon. D.C.L. London: Longmans. Pp. vi. 176. Price, 9s.

hard and accurate thinking the habit of 'taking it to the Lord in prayer.' " He deals some shrewd blows, in Essays I. and III., at the extravagances of some psychologists who are not alive to the fact that they are forging double-edged weapons. His essay on Freedom is central in his thought, and deserves special consideration. "For the Christian the goodness of God is the ground of the rationality in the universe, in virtue of which man, in his inquiries about it, finds a 'dependableness' in its behaviour which makes the inquiry worth pursuing" (p. 36). "There does exist what may be called a true freedom of choice, that is to say, a power of self-determination which is controlled neither by external circumstances nor by man's internal past development as summed up in his character at the moment" (p. 39). He condemns Birth Control: with regard to those who think it justifiable, he says: "their consciences must be respected" (p. 87). Here we cannot follow him: for "respected" read "educated." The weakest part of his work is his discussion of Sacraments and the Reunion of Christendom: in this connection the fundamental flaw in his mental outlook is a totally inadequate idea of the Church. If the Professor would give further attention to this question, he would find it worthy of his hardest thinking, and if he would "take it to the Lord in prayer," who knows but what he might come to recognize its true solution.

3—A JESUIT TEXTBOOK OF PHYSICS¹

IN Physics as in other branches of study, new textbooks follow one another in an unceasing flow, hardly differing more from one another than do two runlets from the same stream. Few and far between are the books which display marked originality combined with clearness of treatment. Among this small number must be reckoned Father Wulf's "*Lehrbuch der Physik*," of which the volume under review is the translation. Its author is a teacher of long experience, Professor of Physics in the great House of Studies of the Jesuits of the German Provinces, where he has combined practical experience in teaching with research and the invention of physical apparatus that is widely used. The fruit of all this is seen in the breadth of outlook which marks his book, a result of the aim which Father Wulf expresses in his preface—"to give a co-ordinated account of the fundamental results of Physics."

In consequence of this aim and his independent outlook, the treatment differs widely from that given in most textbooks of

¹ *Modern Physics. A General Survey of its Principles.* By Theodor Wulf, S.J. Translated by C. J. Smith, Ph.D., M.Sc., A.R.C.S. London: Methuen and Co. Pp. xi. 469. Price, 35s.

Physics. Every teacher is aware of the inconvenience,—the juxtaposition of disconnected phenomena and the separation of related facts,—that results from the ordinary division of physics into heat, light, etc. Instead, Father Wulf classifies his subjects according to their natural relations. His first part deals with the simple phenomena of motion and force; from this he passes on to the large-scale phenomena of matter, such as its various states and those included under the subject of heat. This part concludes with the introduction of the atomic theory, which supplies such a simple explanation for these phenomena. In his third part he considers the facts which have brought us so much knowledge about the structure of the atom, those concerning the subject of electricity. After these sections devoted to matter and its structure, the last part of the book deals with the medium underlying all matter, the ether, with its properties as exhibited by light and its position as affected by the theories of Einstein.

The treatment throughout is marked by concentration on principles. This involves, in a book of moderate size and wide scope, leaving out detailed descriptions of phenomena and experiments which causes a certain abstractness of method, and, combined with the Teutonic thoroughness of the treatment, contrasts with the entertaining *schemata*, enlivening elementary textbooks. But the book is one for the professional student—not necessarily of physics or even of science,—but for anyone accustomed and desiring to use his mind. Such a reader will find in it a fullness and definiteness that is very satisfying. And, despite the severe compression of detail in regard to history and experiment, the book is full of interesting facts, many of which are not widely known. Every page bears evidence of wide reading, both in the past and the present of science, presented through the medium of an independent judgment. Perhaps the only point on which the present reviewer would find the author too ready to accept common beliefs is in his enthusiasm for the principle of the conservation of energy. In his use of the modern atomic theory he is as ardent as if the discoveries were his own, but he does not hesitate to point out how great our ignorance is, as yet, on many points of fundamental importance. The last chapter of the book on "the aims of modern physics," is a masterpiece of presentation, in a form intelligible to those who are not physicists or mathematicians, of the most modern theories. To give an outline of these in language that is both correct and non-mathematical is rightly regarded as very difficult, but Father Wulf has succeeded. He has also done well in showing that the revolutionary character of these theories is not a new phenomenon, but one which has occurred—and been a difficulty—at each stage in the history of science when any great advance has been made.

With regard to the translation, perhaps the quality is best indicated by saying that in the body of the book one is not conscious that it is a translation. One rather gets the impression of a mind thinking in ways somewhat foreign but writing his thoughts in English. The impecunious student-class will not like the price (35s.), nor will professors who would gladly see their students use it. However those who can afford it will not regret its cost.

4—A CRITIC OF ECONOMICS¹

IN a long book Mr. Hecht has covered almost the entire field of our modern economic organization, and freely criticizes both theory and practice. Only another book, smaller no doubt but equally technical, would suffice to review it adequately, and even the economic journals will be able to do no more than select a few of its many features for comment. Briefly the central concept of the treatise (it is hardly less) is that of the family living wage. Mr. Hecht takes the average family to be one of father, mother and three children, on the ground that this average is necessary to maintain the population at a constant level, and he claims that in the most primitive state of society every worker, helped by his wife, must have been able to produce the subsistence of an average family. Using this concept (in which there lurks an ambiguity, for children may mean *dependent* children only or *all* children) he claims to construct a new theory of value and of money, and to lay the foundations of a reform of the wages system. In the process of doing so he criticizes unfavourably (often with the aid of unduly long quotations) the classical economists, the theory of marginal utility, and various individuals, such as Mr. McKenna and Major Douglas. His ideal economic order would include compulsory profit-sharing between industries as well as between workers and employers, rationalization, and the fixation of wages and prices by an Industrial Parliament. The last eighty pages of his book he devotes to international trade. Only one point can be dealt with here, and that is his advocacy of family allowances. Although he admits that the value of a male worker's labour is the subsistence of an average family, yet in view of the fact that many families have more than three dependent children he maintains that these *extra* children should be supported by compulsory contributions from the wages of workers who have no children at all or fewer than three. His argument is that in primitive conditions such children had perforce to be supported in this way, and those who are

¹ *Unsolved Problems: National and International*. By John S. Hecht. London: Jarrolds. Pp. 288. Price 16s. net.

called on to foot the bill must not complain; they are only making restitution for what they themselves received during adolescence. Frankly his argument seems very shaky indeed, and if it were valid would lead much more logically to the conclusion that the State should subsidize parents with more than three dependent children. Although he quotes Miss Rathbone, his theory is not likely to appeal to her any more than to those who desire a family wage for all workers, married or not; nor does he seem conversant with more than a few of the objections to Miss Rathbone's scheme. His book gives evidence, in other respects, of very wide reading, and will stimulate those who tackle it seriously to think out for themselves the rights and wrongs of the capitalist system.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

THE Church's debt to St. Augustine in regard to the doctrine of Marriage is hardly less than what she owes him in the matter of Grace. Other Fathers have dealt with the subject incidentally. He was the first to give it thorough discussion both from the point of view of Natural Ethics and from that of Christian Theology, and to supply the Church with answers to the many speculative and practical problems to which marriage gives rise. It has been well said that he did for marriage in the fifth century what the Council of Trent did for it in the sixteenth. In *La Doctrine du Mariage selon S. Augustin*, by Fr. B. Alves Pereira, O.F.M. (Beauchesne: 30.00 fr.), his whole teaching on the subject is collected from his various writings and set forth as a systematic whole. Strangely enough this task had never yet been undertaken, so that the book fills a real lacuna. There can be no two opinions about its merits. It is a work of importance both for the theologian and for the student of Christian Ethics. The author, who died in 1918, completed the book shortly before his death. Circumstances have delayed its publication till the present time. It is a worthy contribution to this year's celebration of the fifteenth centenary of St. Augustine's death.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

Students of Karl Adam's *Spirit of Catholicism* will find matter no less to their mind in his *Two Essays* (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d.); indeed, perhaps even more. The first of these essays, "Christ and the Western Mind," discusses the effect of Christianity upon the Western mind when they first met, and conversely the effect of the Western mind upon ecclesiastical Christendom. Through the Germanic influence the mystic element in Eastern Christianity was tied to the facts of this natural life; from that have come both the true development and the heresies that characterize the history of the Church in the West. But above all, in recent centuries, the tendency outside Catholicity has been to draw away,

first from the Kingship, and then from the Divinity of Christ; the consequences of which are the source of all our present evils. Men have become self-centred; men have become again this-worldly; from these conclusions the author points the way to a revival, with an eloquence worthy of his subject.

The second essay, "Love and Belief," follows up this line of thought; perhaps it is the better of the two. It sets out to prove the dependence of true love on faith; to show that, apart from God, man cannot be loved with a truly selfless love; "I love, therefore I believe," is seen to be a logical conclusion. The two commandments are really not two; the second is a necessary corollary from the first, and without the first has no logical basis. The essay ends with an appeal for "love" as a proof of "belief."

APOLOGETIC.

When the French edition of Canon J. Couturier's account of the Prayer Book question first appeared, at the beginning of last year, we welcomed it "as a useful summary of the whole (Prayer Book) controversy, the like of which has not yet appeared in English," and as therefore likely to prove very valuable to the English reader. Even more valuable will prove the excellent "adapted translation" of the Canon's book made by Fr. R. E. Scantlebury, under the title *The Book of Common Prayer and the Anglican Church* (B.O. and W.: 6s.). Almost alone amongst Continental observers, at least till very lately, the Canon shows an adequate knowledge of English non-Catholic affairs, and he describes the late and present situation with admirable clearness and abundant documentation.

Every now and then there occurs something which shows how skin-deep is the boasted tolerance of Protestant England. Let the Church but insist upon the rights of conscience against some project of the bureaucracy, and the cry of "No Popery" is at once heard; even respectable papers exhibit bad manners towards the Pope, and the geysers of the Protestant underworld begin to spout mud. This is the phenomenon which Father Thurston investigates historically, with that astonishing knowledge of sources which is his *forte*, in *No Popery!* (Sheed and Ward: 7s. 6d. n.). In sixteen chapters, ranging over the present and the past, he details a great variety of attacks on the Popes and the Papacy, the common feature of which is that they are based on malice and prejudice, yet, just because they are anti-Papal, are accepted even by those who in other regards claim to be scholarly and respectable. Never, even in Newman's classical "Position of Catholics," has this phenomenon been more keenly analysed or more abundantly illustrated, and if clergymen like Dean Inge and Dr. Dearmer find themselves in the same galley as continental pornographists, it is because bigotry, a form of intellectual poverty, makes strange bed-fellows. The Anglican continuity-monger finds here short shrift, but against the lower type of controversialist especially—the uneducated retailer of anti-Catholic legend,—this volume provides a storehouse of devastating ammunition. It is, as regards its subject, a *Summa Apologetica* of immense value.

Though Divine Faith is a Divine Gift, and not the conclusion of a logical process, still it is a gift, into the understanding and acceptance of which reason enters essentially, if only because reason is our one means of realizing truth. In *Plain Reasons for Becoming a Catholic*

(Pustet Co., New York; Herder, London: 8s. n.), Father Albert Power, S.J., shows how eminently reasonable the appeal of the Catholic Church is, and must be, since it was instituted by the God of Truth. Reason points to the Church; reason justifies her claims; the mysteries of religion, so far from abrogating its use, call for the exercise of reason at every turn; the precepts and practices of Catholicism are so reasonable that the Church alone can be proved by experience right in enforcing them: in a word, the Church, as God meant her to be, is the light of the world and the salt of the earth. Father Power's persuasive little treatise is just the thing to give to a reasonable outsider.

Father Conway's famous apologetic work, *The Question Box* (The Paulist Press: 50 c., \$1.00, \$2.50), was first published in 1903, and represented a selection of about 1,000 answers to the innumerable queries on matters of faith which the zealous missionary received during an apostolate of thirty-one years. Of the first edition 2,253,000 copies were sold! The second edition, entirely rewritten, brought up to date, and enriched by a full and carefully-chosen bibliography, giving access to a complete course of apologetics, starts with a first printing of 57,000, which by this time may be exhausted, for of the extreme value of the book, both to the Catholic and to the enquirer, there can be no possible doubt.

The appearance of a second edition of Fr. Cahill's remarkable *Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement* (Gill and Son: 5s. n.), three months after the first, is a sign that public interest has been awakened, as well it might be, by his revelations. For, despite the fact that British Masonry is patronized by Royalty and enrolls many Protestant clergymen in its Lodges, it remains essentially anti-Christian and not effectively dissociated from the openly anti-Christian bodies on the Continent. A professedly religious association into which Jews, Hindus, Moslems and other non-Christians may enter "on the level" with so-called Christians, cannot but be opposed to the one divinely-founded religion, and although the rank and file of British Masons would surely repudiate the projects of the brethren abroad, the Craft is none the less organically one. A valuable addition to the volume as it first appeared is the 50 pages of correspondence which it provoked in the Irish papers, and which includes a laboured and wholly unsuccessful attempt by the Deputy Grand Master in Ireland to refute Fr. Cahill's contentions. The spread of a Society, with such a sinister record, in Catholic Ireland is a phenomenon which is made even more extraordinary by this extremely well-documented exposure. On purely civil grounds Freemasonry has been suppressed in Italy, Spain, Hungary, and, we think, in the Argentine, yet it is seemingly encouraged in the Free State! We hope Fr. Cahill's bold indictment of the organization will arouse public opinion against this anomaly.

DEVOTIONAL.

Already favourably known for his *Enchiridion Patristicum*, Father Rouet de Journel, S.J., with the assistance of Father Dutilleul and other Jesuit Fathers, has compiled an *Enchiridion Asceticum* (Herder: 15s.), a worthy successor to the former and to the still more illustrious *Denziger*, the general arrangement and typography of which are followed. The extracts are drawn from Greek and Latin writers of the first

eight centuries, so that the development of ascetical theory may be studied and the authentic mind of the Church fully known. Two copious indexes, one schematic, the other alphabetical, put all this wealth of material within easy reach. The texts are from Migne and the Greek is accompanied by a Latin translation.

Two such dissimilar people as Charles de Foucauld and Baron von Hügel have made the name of Abbé Huvelin, and his fame as a spiritual director, known to English Catholics. Mr. Algar Thorold, who has translated some discourses of the Abbé, with the title **The Love of Our Lord** (B.O. and W.: 6s.), has given such readers the opportunity of a closer acquaintance with the spirit and teaching of the great director. Although the book is composed merely of notes of the Abbé's utterances, which are therefore not presented with the fullness and finish that the author might have wished, still it contains the substance of a great man's understanding of God's revealed love. The various discourses, whether taken from the Gospel or from theology, are directed to expound that unfathomable mystery—God's love for His creatures embodied in Our Lord, the mystery of Love that can speak only through sacrifice, for the Master too had to lose His soul in order to find it. These great and pregnant thoughts are expressed with a freshness and force that makes the book a very welcome addition to our devotional literature.

The late Father Anton Huonder's short meditations for busy priests, called **Zu Füssen des Meisters** (At the Feet of the Divine Master) are published in twelve languages. The present book completes a series which puts Christ's life before the "alter Christus" as a model to shape his character after that of his Divine Master. The author himself collected the matter for this fourth volume—**Die Morgendämmerung** (Herder: 3.60 m.)—which deals with Christ's childhood, and which is edited by one of his brethren. In it we find all the good qualities which procured such a large circle of friends for the preceding parts, namely, light, strength, comfort, direction, stimulation, and practical advice for the apostle of Christ. The history of the infant Jesus is introduced by a few reflections on the prophecies of the Old Law and some theological thoughts on the Incarnation. Naturally a good many meditations are devoted to Our Lady and her rôle in the work of redemption. The meditations on Christ's parting from her and His baptism form a link between the hidden and the public life of Our Lord.

HISTORICAL.

Although Mr. Maurice Wilkinson disavows more than a mere bowing acquaintance with the immense bibliography which, with the help of the librarian of the Sorbonne, he has compiled and appended to his **History of the League, or Sainte Union** (Jackson, Wylie & Co.: 10s. 6d. n.), still he is evidently saturated with that literature; indeed, the ordinary reader, whose knowledge of the League is probably derived mostly from Macaulay's Ballads, may reasonably complain that enough allowance is not made for his ignorance. Mr. Wilkinson writes for the post-graduate historical student. The ordinary reader would expect a preliminary definition of the character and aims of the League, the date of its origin and dissolution, the national and international situation when it arose—a short conspectus, in fact, of the substance of the book. But the author plunges at once *in medias res*, and leaves the reader to gather such facts

for himself. He is given ample material, for, as we have implied, Mr. Wilkinson overflows with his subject and pours out his learning without stint. The course of events, however, was so involved that all the aids that cartography could afford, especially in regard to battles and campaigns, would have been very welcome; but, alas! there is not a single map. Two impressions arise from this mass of detail—the recklessness with which war was made the weapon of ambition, and the disregard for the interests of religion shown by the statesmen of the period. It is not an edifying story.

One of the chief functions of a National University is to investigate and make accessible the nation's "historical remains." We are glad to welcome from the Cork University Press the first of a series of "Irish Historical Documents," being some extracts from Archbishop Peter Lombard's "*De Hibernia Insula Commentarius*," edited with introduction and translation by the late Matthew J. Byrne and called **The Irish War of Defence** (Longmans, Educational Co. of Ireland: 3s. 6d. n.). Lombard wrote his commentary in Rome in 1600, mainly from information received from the Irish Chiefs whom Elizabeth was trying to subdue, for he had left his native country in his 18th year and never returned, even when appointed to the See of Armagh. This volume contains Cc. 23 and 24 of the original, which deal generally with the character and exploits of the O'Neil, Prince of Tyrone, but incidentally it gives a graphic picture of Irish conditions at the time (1598–1600). On p. viii, 1569 should be 1570, and Pius VI. should be Pius V.

Much has been written, but much yet remains to be written, of the many "Irish Brigades," which helped materially to make the history of more than one country, in Europe and in America, during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The fighting spirit of the Irish people, trampled down at home, found its outlet here; only when English politicians came to realize the power that was being wasted did the recruiting of it for the British Army begin. But that, too, was the beginning of Emancipation. Though not strictly one of these Irish Brigades, still, **The Irish Battalion in the Papal Army of 1860**, of which Mr. G. F. H. Berkeley writes (Talbot Press, Dublin: 15s.), is their lineal descendant, the noblest, perhaps, of a noble line, because of the end for which it fought. Though the author frankly avows himself no advocate of the Temporal Power, and freely confesses his admiration of those who planned and established United Italy, still he writes his story wholly concerned with the Irish Battalion as such, and leaves his own political opinions aside. He has gathered his material from first-hand as much as possible, interviewing every survivor he has been able to find. It is a story with a foregone conclusion, sad to read, yet none the less thrilling.

We have had many monographs lately, large and small, on the history and spirit of the great pioneer Order of Monks founded by St. Benedict, which took such a large share in the civilization of Europe; still, **L'Ordre Bénédictin** (Éditions Rieder, Paris: 20.00 fr.), compact yet exhaustive, covering the whole monastic ideal and its gradual development to our own days, which Dom Henri Leclercq has published, is in no way superfluous, the less so that it contains some 60 photogravures, illustrating Benedictine art and architecture, and famous Benedictine saints and doctors.

LITURGICAL.

Children can hardly be introduced too early to the wonder and glory of the Catholic Liturgy, as is recognized in many schools where children are instructed to make for themselves all that pertains to the Holy Sacrifice. The same wise plan is followed in *The Child's Daily Missal*, sold on behalf of the Liturgical Apostolate by G. Coldwell Ltd. at 3s. 6d. and 7s. 6d. It is a translation by the Rev. John Gray of a (? French) work compiled by Dom G. Lefebvre, O.S.B., and Mlle E. Van Ellwyck, and is profusely illustrated in colours. Everything that a child can want to explain, in terms suited to his intelligence, the symbolism of the Mass, etc., is to be found in this excellent book.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

It is not long since we had occasion to praise the Life of St. Angela Merici, by Sister Monica, O.S.U. Now, in *The Cross in the Wilderness, a Biography of Pioneer Ohio* (Longmans: 16s.), the same author tells the story of the latter-day coming of St. Angela's Ursulines to America. Deliberately choosing a racy, romantic, allusive style, as becomes the subject, the author tells us of the country when the white men first came to the Ohio valley, of the first growth of the Faith in that valley, and then of the settling there of Julia Chatfield, of Ponder's End (of all places!), in religion Sister Julia of the Assumption. It is a wonderful story of adventure, and enterprise, and suffering, and patience, and ultimate triumph. Sister Monica seems to have said to herself: "All the world has been recently moved by a romance—'Death comes to the Archbishop,'—a precisely similar book may be written of a woman pioneer, and we may keep to the facts all the time." This she has attempted; with the result that we are given a living picture of the growth of the Church in America during the first half of last century, and of America itself around it. The war between North and South, of course, comes into the picture and is looked at from another angle.

As long ago as June, 1926, we reviewed with approval the first volume of Father Harold Burton's English adaptation of Abbé Hamon's *Vie de S. Francois de Sales*. Vol. II. of *The Life of St. Francis of Sales* (B.O. and W.: 15s.) followed the first in the course of last year, but we have not been able to notice it till now. It continues and concludes the Saint's career, from the foundation of the Visitation (1610) till his death (1622)—twelve years of intense activity, the details of which are conscientiously recorded, but, as everything illustrates the charming holiness and humour of the Saint, nothing set down is too trivial. These two fine volumes, based on the standard French Life, must long constitute the standard English Life as well, of one of the most lovable of saints.

No one could have better claims for a place in a series of biographies called "Les Grands Cœurs" than the late Cardinal Mercier, and no one is better fitted to voice these claims than M. Georges Goyau, who has studied the career of the great Belgian Churchman with much sympathy. In *Le Cardinal Mercier* (Flammarion: 12.00 fr. n.) we have the salient points of that career set forth with admirable clearness—the priest, the philosopher, the bishop, the statesman, the heroic patriot; all receive their due. Only in the one matter of the famous "Malines Conversations" is M. Goyau less satisfactory, because less well-informed of the English Catholic point of view, which, with all respect to the late Abbé

Portal and Dom Lambert Beauduin, is the right point of view. Happily, the matter has been definitely set to rest by the publication of *Mortalium Animos*, which renders any such mistaken *démarche* impossible in future. The issue of this great and illuminative Encyclical on the principles of Unity is the one positive good for which we have to thank "Malines."

The ceremony in St. Peter's on June 29th, when the eight heroic martyrs of North America were canonized, gives additional appositeness to the posthumous work of the late Père H. Fouqueray, **Martyrs of Canada** (Téqui: 15.00 fr.), which P. Alain de Becdelièvre has revised and prepared for the press. It is a thoroughly scientific memoir, well-documented and up to date, and it tells a story of heroic constancy rarely if ever equalled, and never excelled, in the history of the Church. North America, always in the vanguard with the products of material civilization, has hitherto not been prolific in saints. She could not lay a more inspiring foundation for future essays in sainthood than these illustrious eight afford.

A pious Canadian youth of to-day went far to supply that want; witness **Excelsior: the Story of Lucien Delorme** (1905-1926), a brief biography, translated from the French of Père A. Dragon, S.J., by R. Glody. Called to God while still a novice of the Society, Lucien did not win sanctity in this life, but he showed by act and aspiration how it should be sought.

Father Martindale's study of St. Ignatius, one of a series depicting Jesuit saints, has been translated into French by Père Dechene, S.J.—**Saint Ignace de Loyola** (Lethielleux: 9.00 fr.) "d'une façon," we are assured by the publisher, "qui concilie la saveur de l'original avec la clarté et les exigences de l'esprit français."

A most pleasing present for First Communicants and others would be the life of **Blessed Imelda Lambertini**, Virgin of the Dominican Order, from the French of Renée Zeller, with a Preface by Father Roche, S.J. (Sands: 3s. 6d. n.). This life, too, has been founded for the most part on the Bollandists; to many it will be a delight to discover how much is known of this patron of children communicants. It is all a beautiful story, charming in subject and elegantly written.

Not long ago we had occasion to notice a life of Saint Columba, told by "Iona" in the author's original way. Now this has been followed by **The Story of St. Brigid** (Talbot Press, Dublin: 2s. 6d. n.), related in the same manner. It is in the form of a dialogue. One who knew the Saint, St. Blatti, is questioned by a novice concerning Brigid, and the chief events of her life are thus drawn out, taken in great part from the Bollandists. And they are told with much enthusiasm and devotion; indeed, if we may judge from the Preface of this book, St. Patrick himself will have to look to his laurels if he would keep his place as the patron of Ireland. There are many pleasing illustrations.

FICTION.

A long psychological novel called **Milled Grain** (Heath Cranton: 7s. 6d.), by Sidney Hopwood, deals with the love of two very dissimilar women—one a Catholic—for a handsome, talented but worthless man, who can't run straight even with his friends. It is the Catholic who befriends him when he has been rejected by his wife, in spite of the social risks incurred, which culminate in a divorce. The man finally finds a male

friend who sets him on the way to fortune, whilst the heroine seeks happiness more surely in an active Order devoted to the world's castaways. The writer is evidently a practised hand, but the story would gain by compression and the "Catholic" view is somewhat sketchy.

There is much "psychology"—long-drawn analysis of motive and description of reactions—in *Fool's Pilgrimage* (Herder Book Co.: \$2.00), by H. J. Scheibl, which sketches the career of an ambitious college youth, who yet cannot concentrate on any one line. Though educated a Catholic, religion apparently means nothing to him, and he tries to find satisfaction elsewhere. But all is vanity and he returns to the Faith, only to lose his life in defence of one who had helped to lead him astray, who herself thereupon became a Carmelite. Though there is much good writing and sound philosophizing in the book, the author has not sufficiently vitalized his puppets to make it altogether convincing.

In *Secret Places* (Alexander-Ousley: 6s. n.), Evelyn Marshall Allen furnishes a very crowded canvas, so that it is not easy to remember the various relationships of the numerous characters. But when once that is done, the reader will enjoy a cleverly-constructed story, full of exciting incident and bright dialogue, reaching back to the days of the English persecution and forward to that in China to-day, and instinct with a genuine Catholic spirit.

Lovers of music will be delighted with *The School by the River* (B.O. and W.: 5s. n.), by Elinor M. Brent-Dyer, which concerns the experiences, dramatic and domestic, of a girl, an "infant prodigy" of sorts, in a Continental "Musical Academy" devoted wholly to the higher instruction of the musically-gifted; a story which is apparently sketched from life. The narrative is lively, and the strange school-life is excellently described.

College Days at the Manor (Benziger Bros.: \$1.25) is a stirring story for girls by Mary D. Ten Eyck, containing a plentiful supply of incidents, athletic and academic, at an American convent, and a happy finale.

From memory of his experiences in Eastern lands, aided no less by a vivid and picturesque imagination, Father Neil Boynton, S.J., a well-known writer of boys' books, has produced a collection of short stories, *In Xavier Lands* (Benziger: \$1.25), the moral of which is easily and profitably carried out by their narrative interest. The book on this account may possibly do wider good than one more obviously written to edify.

VERSE.

Life and My Life, by Felix Harte (Cahill and Co., Dublin), deals with Ireland, and is "literary," well written, interesting, but lacking in ease and spontaneity, clever but a little blasé: more completely satisfying than the original pieces are the translations from Horace.

NON-CATHOLIC.

It is not quite clear to the present reviewer what is the special aim of *Two Men of Alexandria*; Philo and Origen; some of their shorter sayings and incidental side issues, collected and translated by Herbert Gaussen, M.A. (Heath Cranton: 2s.). Probably it is to allow the reader to compare the mentality of one with the other by means of a multitude of sentences and *dicta* taken from their works as we have them. Cer-

tainly there is much to be learnt from such a comparison. At the same time there is always the difficulty which must present itself in such cases; a sentence taken apart may have its meaning much modified when seen in its context. Still there are many sayings here which are full of instruction, both as illustrations of the age in which they were written and also for our own time.

We wonder what our parish priests would think if they had to prove to their congregations that religion was "disinterested delight in God," or what their congregations would think of them if they tried to prove it. We wonder what they would think if they had to discuss in their pulpits such questions as whether or not God could be known. And if they produced as evidence of this the fact that prayer was heard, we wonder how they would feel if they had to begin by warning their hearers that this was only a private opinion, and that many of their fellow-priests did not agree with them. Yet this is the substance of **Our Heavenly Father**, A Study of the Nature and Doctrine of God, by the Rev. Peter Green, M.A. (Longmans: 4s.). We have read other works by the same author, and always we are left with the same impression. We are in presence of a true apostle, one who is willing to descend to any level if only he can lift up his people to a higher idea of religion. But he is conscious that he is fighting a losing battle; he just does not despair; he clings to any sign that lifts him up. If he would only see how little influence a teacher can have who gives to his people a doctrine which, he has to confess, is after all only his own private opinion! That is the weak point of his argument; it is the weak point of many such books, however otherwise earnest, and zealous, and subjectively true.

The growing devotion outside the Church to our Catholic saints may yet prove a means of conversion; such at least is the reflection we are drawn to make as we read **A People's Book of Saints**, by J. Alick Bouquet (Longmans: 7s. 6d.). It contains short sketches, covering some ten pages each, of thirty-seven saints, from St. Ignatius of Antioch to St. Francis de Sales. Clearly the author's whole aim is to show that his Church and theirs is the same; he does it by taking it for granted, and by quoting on the same page Anglican and Catholic divines. The stories are deliberately human and attractive; there are sixteen illustrations, fifteen of which are good.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. R. Francis Foster, whose *Secret Places* we reviewed in August of last year, is of the school of Belloc and Stevenson, and all the essayists who tramp the countryside and detail in choice English the impressions, historical, topographical, scenical, that they meet with; always giving out more than they take in, from minds well stored, full of playful fancy and abundant humour. His new book—**Joyous Pilgrimage** (Elkin Mathews and Marrot: 7s. 6d. n.)—records the tramp of two boon companions through the S.E. of England, and the adventures and persons they meet with. Some 35 pretty line drawings of various landscape add much to the attractiveness of the volume.

We are in the midst of another struggle with the Government, local and national, of this country for educational justice—a struggle which goes back to our first emergence from the Penal Laws, and which will never end until the authorities recognize the conscientious rights of

the Catholic poor. The foremost champion in that fight was in his time the second Archbishop of Westminster, as we have lately been reminded by a very necessary book compiled by Canon Edward St. John, and called **Manning's Work for Children** (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d.). A recent life of Cardinal Newman, in making a rather superficial contrast between the two Cardinals, said "Manning has gone and has left hardly a trace." Canon St. John's timely volume is a confutation of that shallow verdict. Many thousands of the most helpless class of children have received and kept the precious heritage of the Faith through his persistent efforts on their behalf. Canon St. John, who was one of the Cardinal's able lieutenants, has been very well advised to record, from his own recollections and from Manning's writings and speeches, the story of this apostolic campaign. Our own difficulties in getting the elements of social justice into the heads of our rulers are very much less than those which he encountered: we are reaping what he had sown and watered.

Miss J. E. Lowe, with a view to making students independent of external tuition, has supplemented her Latin reading book by a **Key to Folia Latina** (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d.).

Now that, to judge by the Press, this country is exhibiting to the wondering foreigner a seemingly greater interest in the cricket fortunes of various counties than in the grim spectres of unemployment and industrial decay, Mr. Neville Cardus's **Cricket** (Longmans: 3s. 6d. n.), one of the "English Heritage" series, comes opportunely to provide a philosophic background for this national game. He traces its development and analyses its character and charm, with abundance of illustration from great events and personalities: an Index of Names would provide a list of almost all the great cricketers of the last half century. An eminently readable book, combining literature and technique.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

A noteworthy feature of the times is the increasing study of the Christian Liturgy and the number of liturgical publications issued to meet the demand of the faithful. To the Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, Catholics are indebted for a systematic attempt to provide them with all that is requisite in this matter. Conspicuous amongst its latest books is **The Mass-Drama**, by William Busch (35 cents), which shows that in the Divine Sacrifice there is unity of structure corresponding with unity of purpose. The author, Professor of Church History, has read widely and to good effect: his careful bibliography will be found very useful.

From the same Press come other booklets in furtherance with its objects, e.g., **If I be Lifted Up**, an Essay on the Sacrifice of the Mass, by the Rev. P. Bussard (10 cents); **The Liturgical Movement**, by Dom V. Michel (5 cents); **The Liturgy and the Layman**, a collection of addresses, which in its title makes the usual mistake of ignoring the devout sex (5 cents), and a similar collection at the same price, called **The Chant of the Church**.

A certain W.M.B. has compiled for every day of the year a collection of **Thoughts of the Curé D'Ars** (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d.), some of which are very striking and all very edifying.

An ingenious means of combining the useful with the pleasant is provided by the "**Play-an-O**" card game (Coldwell, Ltd.: 2s.) on the

subject of Christian Doctrine. Its general idea is that of exciting interest and rewarding proficiency in remembering the Catechism. It is proposed to extend the system to the Liturgy.

The most important of the recent C.T.S. pamphlets is "the statement of facts" which Fr. MacGillivray calls **The Anti-God Front of Bolshevism**: an indictment of that devilish system, drawn from authentic sources mainly Soviet, which should dispel the doubts even of the most prejudiced secularist as to the degrading, anti-human achievements and aims of the present masters of Russia. A very edifying life of a young Catholic officer—**The Hon. H. E. Dormer**—who died in Canada in 1866 and whose "cause" is being actively promoted there, has been written, compiled from previous biographies and other sources, by the Rev. B. Kelly. A second series of C.A.S. leaflets—**Questions and Answers**—should extend the usefulness of these summaries of the Faith. **The Marriage Service** contains all that is necessary for intelligent participation in that momentous function. A **Large-Print Mass-Book** will help people of failing sight or frequenters of dim churches. Amongst reprints are—**How to Help the Sick and Dying**: **Mary Ward**, by M. M. Joseph; three famous sermons of Newman's, **Christ upon the Waters**, **Illuminating Grace**, and **Mary and Her Glories**; also, **Faith Healing in the Gospels**, by Father Steuart, S.J., and **The Religion of the Koran**, by Father E. Power, S.J.

All about **Church Bells** can be found in a pamphlet so named, by A. T. Adams (C.T.S. of Ireland). From the same Society also come **The Catholic Church and the Sick**, by Dr. Mary Cardwell, a fine testimony to the social utility of the Church in these islands. Another aspect of the Church's social work may be seen in **Medieval Trade Guilds**, by M. A. Brunning, B.A. The Rev. L. Rumble, S.T.D., in **Why Should You be a Catholic**, states the claims of the Church in a graphic and convincing fashion.

The heroic lives of two of the Canadian martyrs—**Saint Isaac Jogues** and **Saint John Brébeuf**—are told by Father N. Boynton in the Jesuit Mission Series, Nos. 5 and 6.

In **The Homecroft Movement** (National Homecroft Association, 6d. n.), Mr. J. W. Scott tells how the most hopeful endeavour of modern times to get rid of our industrial paralysis came into being and is being fostered.

The report of **The Convert's Aid Society** for 1929 contains the usual blend of hope and humour and tragedy, and it has moved at least one reader to send a belated subscription! One rejoices that its annual "turnover" now exceeds £11,000: one grieves that even this does not satisfy all the pitiable claims upon it.

At last the Catholic Poetry Society has achieved that sure token of stability and progress—a monthly organ of its own; it is appropriately called **Carmina** (Longmans: 1s.), and its 32 pages are full of interesting matter—original verse, criticism, translations,—besides being graced by a portrait of the President, the Hon. Evan Morgan.

The Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, to which reference is made elsewhere in this issue, has published a translation of the famous Encyclical of Sept. 8, 1928, on **The Need of Intellectual and Practical Interest in the Near East**.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- ANGUS AND ROBERTSON, Sydney.
Catholic Education in New South Wales. By Rev. Brother U. Corrigan. Pp. xiii. 151. Price, 3s. 6d.
- BENZIGER BROS., New York.
Character Education. Pp. xii. 124. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
Fénelon sur Le Gnostique de Saint Clement d'Alexandrie. Edited by Père Paul Dudon, S.J. Pp. 300. Price, 50.00 fr.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.
The Book of Common Prayer and the Anglican Church. By the Very Rev. Canon J. Couturier. Translated by the Very Rev. R. E. Scantlebury. Pp. xiv. 216. Price, 6s. *The New and Eternal Covenant.* By Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B. Pp. vii. 289. Price, 6s. *Key to Folia Latina.* By J. E. Lowe, M.A. Pp. vi. 32. Price, 2s. 6d. *Sanctifying Grace.* By Rev. E. Towers. Pp. 85. Price, 1s. *Jesus Christ Man and God.* By Rev. G. D. Smith, D.D. Pp. 89. Price, 1s. *Twelve years in the Catholic Church.* By J. L. Stoddard. Pp. x. 174. Price, 7s. 6d. *Thoughts of the Curé D'Ars.* Compiled by W.M.B. Pp. 121. Price, 2s. 6d. *A Brief Rule. The Oratory of the Faithful Soul.* Vol. VII. of Works of Blossius. Pp. xix. 168. Price, 3s. 6d. *Catholic Scripture Manuals, St. Luke.* 2nd Edition. By Madame Cecilia. Pp. xx. 292. Price, 6s. *The Four Churches of Peking.* By W. Devine. Pp. 225. Price, 7s. 6d. *In Praise of Divine Love.* By Alice, Lady Lovat. Pp. 162. Price, 6s. *Half Hours with St. John's Gospel.* By Charles Blount, S.J. Pp. 120. Price, 3s. 6d. *The School by the River.* By Elinor M. Brent-Dyer. Pp. 244. Price, 5s.
- CATHOLIC RECORDS PRESS, Exeter.
Report of the Society of St. V. de P. for 1929. Pp. 272.
- CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, Washington.
Thomas Dongan Governor of New York. By John H. Kennedy, S.T.L. Pp. ix. 131. *St. Basil and Monasticism.* By Sister M. G. Murphy. Pp. xix. 112. *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography, to 543 A.D.* By Sister M. B. O'Brien. Pp. iv. 173. *Anti-Papal Legislation in Medieval England (1066—1377).* By John T. Ellis, A.M. Pp. xiv. 137. *Church and State in Visigothic Spain.* By A. K. Ziegler, M.A. Pp. viii. 221. *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. Gregory of Nyassa.* By G. W. P. Hoey. Pp. xviii. 126. *The Pagan Divinities according to St. Augustine.* By Sister M. D. Madden, M.A. Pp. x. 135. Price, \$3.00.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
The Knowledge of Reality. By Wincenty Lutoslawski. Pp. xvii. 105. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- COLDWELL LTD., London.
The Play-an-O Method of Christian Doctrine. Price, 2s.
- CONSTABLE, London.
Impressions and Comments. Third and Final Series. By Havellock Ellis. Pp. 241. Price, 6s.
- CORK UNIVERSITY PRESS, Ireland.
The Irish War of Defence, 1598—1600. By Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh. Edited by M. J. Byrne. Pp. x. 92. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- DENHAM PARSONS, Chiswick.
Report on Shakespeare's Identity: Submitted to British Museum. Pp. 31. Price, 1s. 6d.
- DENT AND SONS, London.
The Free Church Sacrament and Catholic Ideals. By T. W. Coleman. Pp. x. 118. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *A Free Church Psalter.* By P. Taylor, B.Mus. Pp. xii. 207. Price, 1s. 6d. n.
- DESSAIN, Mechlin.
Epitome Juris Canonici. Tom. II. 4th Edit. By A. Vermeersch and J. Creusen, S.J. Pp. xvi. 551. Price, 25.00 fr.
- DON BOSCO INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, Assam.
Life of Blessed Don Bosco. By A. Anderson, S.C. Pp. 593. Price, 4s. n.

- "EDITIONS SPES," Paris.
Jésus Messie. By H. P. de la Boullaye, S.J. Pp. 270. Price, 12.00 fr. *La Loi de l'Homme.* By Felix Soignon, S.J. Pp. xxxi. 132. Price, 10.00 fr.
- GEOFFREY BLES, London.
Cardinal Newman. By J. Lewis May. Pp. xi. 263. Price, 10s. 6d.
- HERDER, London.
The Saviour as St. Matthew saw Him. Vol. II. By Rev. F. J. Haggeny, S.J. Pp. 354. Price, 9s. n. *The Sacraments and the Commandments.* By Rev. A. M. Skelly, O.P. Pp. vi. 306. Price, 8s. n. *Fool's Pilgrimage.* By H. G. Scheibl. Pp. 276. Price, 7s. n. *The Criminal.* By H. A. Geisert. Pp. xii. 466. Price, 10s. 6d. n.
- HOLY CROSS COLLEGE, Worcester, Mass.
Jefferson: O'Connell. Two Orations. By Claude G. Bowers. Pp. ix. 88. Price, \$1.00.
- HOME CROFT ASSOCIATION, Cardiff.
The Homecroft Movement. By J. W. Scott. Pp. 14. Price, 6d. n.
- JARROLD, London.
Blanquerna. By Ramon Lull. Translated by E. Allison Peers. Pp. 536. Price, 30s. n.
- LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris.
L'Ancienne Liturgie Gallicane. By Père J. B. Thibaut. Pp. 117. *Almanach des Vacances.* Pp. 126. Price, 1.25 fr.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.
L'Evangile commenté par S. Augustin. Edited by R. P. Thona-Barthet. Pp. 300. Price, 25.00 fr.
- LA PENSEE CATHOLIQUE, Liège.
De Matrimonii Sacramento. By C. M. Salmon, O.P. Pp. 156.
- LIBRAIRIE FLAMMARION, Paris.
Lourdes. By Gaetan Bernoville. Pp. 240. Price, 10.00 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.
Carmina. First number. Pp. 32. Price, 1s. *Divers Orders of Ministers.* By W. Lockton, B.D. Pp. viii. 254. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *The Bible Beautiful.* By Mother Mary Eaton. Pp. 440. Price, 2s. *Good News from God.* By the Bishop of London. Pp. 127. Price 3s. 6d. *The Grace of God.* By N. P. Williams. Pp. 117. Price, 4s. n.
- LITURGICAL PRESS, Minnesota.
The Mass Drama. By William Busch. Pp. vii. 94. Price, 35 c.
- LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS, Chicago.
Excelsior. By A. Dragon, S.J. Pp. 86. Price, \$1.00.
- MARI E MARIETTI, Turin.
Horae Diurnae Breviarii Romani. Fourth Edition. Pp. 1,168. Price, 30.00 l. *Ordo Divini Officii Recitandi, 1931.* Pp. 119. Price, 3.00 l.
- PONT. INST. ORIENT. STUDIOURUM, Rome.
L'Union de L' Orient avec Rome. By H. Pierre, O.S.B. Pp. 156. Price, 26.00 l. *Cartulary of the Greek Monastery of St. Elias.* Edited with translation by Gertrude Robinson, M.A. Pp. 197. Price, 37.00 l. *The Need of Interest in the Near East.* Translation of the Pope's Encyclical. Pp. 16.
- PUSTET, New York. [HERDER, London.]
The Christian Life. By Rev. Antony Thona-Barthet, O.S.A. Pp. xviii. 670. Price, 12s. n. *Augustine of Hippo.* By K. J. Mullany. Pp. ix. 196. Price, 7s. n. *Sermons for the High Mass.* By Rev. J. A. Whelan, O.S.A. Pp. xi. 380. Price, 12s. n.
- RAUCH, Innsbruck.
Der Anteil des Volkes an der Messliturgie im Frankenreiche. By Georg Nickl. Pp. x. 76. Price, 3.59 m.
- SHEED AND WARD, London.
No Popery! By Herbert Thurston, S.J. Pp. x. 119. Price, 7s. 6d. *For Joan of Arc.* By Marshal Foch and others. Pp. vii. 131. Price, 7s. 6d. *Six Sacraments.* Edited by C. Lattey, S.J. Pp. 294. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Christ and the Western Mind: Love and Belief.* By Karl Adam. Pp. 80. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *Labourers in the Vineyard.* By Giovanni Papini. Translated by Alice Curtayne. Pp. xi. 251. Price, 7s. 6d. *One Lord One Faith.* By Vernon Johnson. Pp. 208. Price, 1s. n.
- S.P.C.K., London.
The Coming of Mysticism (1590-1620). By Henri Bremond. Pp. 451. Price, 16s.

[Several acknowledgements held over.]

a
i.

,

l.

i

.

.

b.

g

s.

r.

f

t.

r-

v.

A.

n.

J.

e,

h

n,

e,

r

e.

s-

ce,

By

p.

ix

C.

e,

he

nd

p.

rs

ni

ce

e,

h.

8.

-

p.